

Illinois political campaign of 1858.

Illinois political campaign of 1858.

m 'k .t'^i-^y.

i V' 4.t IS' 1

H r0Mm

-At .

^w^

-" ;.' 4t'^- ^^j^?4M \'^1 A4'*V^'

i.^i&m^ i^^x^zf^rSi^-.ai

f(A

m ^ ^<A i

v ..

a:{ /: ^?&Z /z^li^^ Qu^.^0^ /l^^^; a-^i^--^ ^^

9t> r^ s,

!^>^ jad<'-.t-'iSkfmMS^ i

j t'oattasteH ef th KesmblioAP State Conveii- (leu. HON. ABKAHAM IINCOLN. .^X'olal Ccvt'espoudence of the Chicago Tribuuaj (_ Speixgfikld, June 17, lg5^ . The delegates and citizens reassembled at the RepresentatiYOfi'Halk shortly before eight o'clock to listen to a speedi from Hou. Ablu- HiM LisciM. Judge ICceaer took the chatr. The we&ther was inleusely hot and the Hall crowded almost to sufibcation. Before tb<3 spoakiiiig commenced it was suggested that the' audionoo adjourn to

the north from of the kState House. Mr. Lincouj said he did not intend to make a long speech, and that he would comply with the wishes of his hearers, by addressing the people in the open air if they participated in it; at the same time his voice is not in excellent condition, and he would speak in the building. There being no objection, Mr. Lincoln proceeded: Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention; If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year, since a policy was initiated toward the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation, under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only, not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease, until a crisis shall have been reached and passed, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be preserved, except it will come all one or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery, will arrest the further spread of it, or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike legal in all the States, old as well as new North as well as South. Have we no tendency to the latter condition? Let every one who doubts, carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination piece (if machinery so to speak) composed of the Nebraska doctrine, and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider not only what work this machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted; but also, let him study the history of its construction, and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he cannot, to trace the evidences of design, and concert of action, attending; Its chief architects, from the beginning. The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the States by State Compact, and from most of the national territory by Congressional prohibition. For six days hence, commenced the struggle, which ended in its defeat; That Congressional prohibition; This occupied all the national territory to slavery; and was the first point gained. But, so far, Congress only, had acted; and an interference by the people, real or nominal, was indispensable, to save the point already gained, and give chance for more. This necessity had not been overlooked; it had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "sovereignty," otherwise called "sacred right of self-government," under the latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any man, choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska bill itself, in the language which follows: "It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom; but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "Squatter Sovereignty," and "sacred right of self government," "But," said opposition members, "let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the territory may exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska bill was passing through congress, a law case involving the question of a negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free State and then into a Territory covered by the congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave; for a long time in each, was "(tis*;ngii;.,aoU the XJ. S. Circuit Court for the district of Missouri; and both Nebraska bill and law suit; were argued in the same month in or May, 1857, v. -u^Ured Scott," which finally made it the case." Before the then next Presidential election, the law case came to, and was argued in, the Supreme Court of the United States: but the decision of it was deferred until after the election. Still before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requests the leading advocate of the Nebraska bill to state his opinion whether the people of a Territory can constitutionally exclude slavery from their limits: and he answers, "that is no question for the Supreme Court," The election came. Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the endorsement, "such as it was secured. That was the second point gained" The endorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly four hundred thousand votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The outgoing President, in his last annual message as impressively as possible echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the endorsement. The Supreme Court met again; did not announce their decision, but ordered a reargument. The Presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the court but the incoming President in his inaugural address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, whatever it might be. Then, in a few days, came the decision. "The reputed author of the Nebraska bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capital endorsing the Dred Scott decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to endorse and strongly counter that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained!" At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska bill, - on the mere question of fact, whether the Lecompton Constitution was or was not, in any just sense, made by the people of Kansas; and in that quarrel the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other, than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind the principle for which he declares he has suffered so much, and is ready to suffer to the end. And well may he cling to that principle. If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine. Under the late decision, "squabbling sovereignty" if ever, of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding like the mould at the foundry served through one blast and fell back into loose sand - helped to carry an election, and then was kicked to the winds, His late joint struggle with the Republicans, against the Lecompton Constitution, involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point - the right of a people to make their own constitution, - upon which he and the Republicans have never differed. The

several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas' "care not" policy, consists, in the piece of machinery, in its present state of advancement. The points of that machinery are : First, That no negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave, can ever be a citizen of any State, in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States. This point is made in order to deprive the negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of that provision of the United States Constitution, which declares that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." Secondly, That "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature can exclude slavery from any United States territory. This point is made in order that individuals may fill up the territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus to enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future. Thirdly, That whether the holding a negro in actual slavery in a free State, makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave State the negro may be forced into by the master. This point is made, not to be pressed immediately ; but, if acquiesced in for a while, and apparently endorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott's master might lawfully do with Dred Scott, in the free State of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one, or one thousand slaves, in Illinois, or in any other free State. . . . Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mould public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up. This shows exactly where we now are ; and partially, indeed, whither we are tending. It will throw additional light on the matter

^i-: -ttSS-i fc<^iSSBfjii!tjaBif,ir.s-J^33j_o. ',,4_j,./fflj,.. ? -) -^v. ^ K, '>-, I ni

to go back, and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. "the people were to be left " perfectly free/ " subject only to the Constitution." What the Constitution had to do with it, outsiders, could not then see. Plainly enough now, it was an exactly fitted niche, for the Dred Scott decision to afterwards come in, and declare the perfect freedom of the people, to be just no freedom at all. Why was the amendment, expressly declaring the right of the people, voted down ? Plainly enough now : the adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision. Why was the court decision held up ? Why even a Senator's individual opinion withheld, till after the Presidential election ? Plainly enough now: the speaking out then would have damaged the perfectly free argument upon which the election was to be carried. Why the outgoing President's felicitation on the endorsement ? Why the delay of a re-argument ? Why the incoming President's advance exhortation in favor of the decision ? These things look like the cautious patting and petting of a

spirited horse preparatory to mounting him, when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. And why the hasty after- endorsement of the decision by the President and others? We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few not omitting even scaffolding or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such piece in in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck. It should not be overlooked that, by the Nebraska bill, the people of a State as well as Territory, were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only to the Constitution." Why mention a State? They were legislating for Territories, and not for or about States. Certainly the people of a State are and ought to be subject to the Constitution of the United States; but why is mention of this tugged into this merely Territorial law? Why are the people of a Territory and the people of a State therein lumped together, and their relation to the Constitution therein treated as being precisely the same? While the opinion of the Court, by Chief Justice Taney, in the Dred Scott case, and the separate opinions of all the concurring Judges, expressly declare that the Constitution of the United States neither permits Congress nor a Territorial Legislature to exclude Slavery from any United States Territory, they all omit to declare whether or not the same Constitution permits a State, or the people of a State, to exclude it. Possibly, this is a mere omission; but who can be quite sure, if McLean or Curtis had sought to get into the opinion a declaration of unlimited power in the people of a State to exclude Slavery from their limits, just as Chase and Mace sought to get such declaration, in behalf of the people of a Territory, into the Nebraska bill; I ask, who can be quite sure that it would not have been voted down in the one case as it had been in the other? The nearest approach to the point of declaring the power of a State over Slavery, is made by Judge Nelson. He approaches it more than once, using the precise idea, and almost the language, too, of the Nebraska act. On one occasion, his exact language is, "except in cases where the power is restrained by the Constitution of the United States, the law of the State is supreme over the subject of Slavery within its jurisdiction," In what cases the power of the States is so restrained by the United States Constitution, is left an open question, precisely as the same question as to the restraint on the power of the Territories was left open in the Nebraska act. Put this and that together, and we have another nice little niche, which we may ere long, see filled with another Supreme Court decision, declaring that the Constitution of the United States does not permit a State to exclude slavery from its limits. And this may especially be expected if the doctrine of "care not whether slavery be voted down or voted up" shall gain upon the public mind sufficiently

to give promise that such a decision can be maintained when made. Such a decision is all that slavery now lacks of being alike lawful in all the States. Welcome or unwelcome, such decision is probably coming, and will soon be upon us, unless the power of the present political dynasty shall be met and overthrown. We shall lie down pleasantly dreaming that the people of Missouri are on the verge of making their State free, and we shall awake to the reality instead, that the Supreme Court has made Illinois a slave State. To meet and overthrow the power of that dynasty, we have to do, how can we best do it? There are those who denounce us openly to their own friends, and yet whisper us softly, that Senator Douglas is the aptest instrument there is, with which to affect that object. They wish us to infer all, from the fact, that he now has a little quarrel with the present head of the dynasty; and that he has regularly voted with us on a single point, upon which, he and we, have never differed. They remind us that he is a very great man, and that the largest of us are very small ones. Let this be granted. But "a living dog is better than a dead lion." Judge Douglas, if not a dead lion, for this work, is at least a caged and toothless one. How can he oppose the advances of slavery? He doesn't care anything about it. His avowed mission is impressing the "public heart" to care nothing about it. A leading Douglas Democratic newspaper thinks Douglas' superior talent will be needed to resist the revival of the African slave trade. Does Douglas believe an effort to revive that trade is approaching? He has not said so. Does he really think so? But if it is, how can he resist it? For years he has labored to prove it a sacred right of white men to take negro slaves into the new territories. Can he possibly show that it is less a sacred right to buy them where they can be bought cheapest? And unquestionably they can be bought cheaper in Africa than in Virginia. He has done all in his power to reduce the whole question of slavery to one of a mere right of property; and as such, how can he oppose the foreign slave trade how can he refuse that trade in that "property" shall be "perfectly free" unless he does it as a protection to the home production? And as the home producers will probably not ask the protection, he will be wholly without a ground of opposition. Senator Douglas holds, we know, that a man may, rightfully be wiser to-day than he was yesterday that he may rightfully change when he finds himself wrong. But, can we for that reason, run ahead, and infer that he will make any particular change, of which he, himself, has given no intimation? Can we safely base our action upon any such vague inference? Now, as ever, I wish not to misrepresent Judge Douglas' position, question his motives, or do aught that can be personally offensive to him. Whenever, if ever, he and we can come together on principle so that our cause may have assistance from his great ability, I hope to have interposed no adventitious obstacle. But clearly, he is not now with us he does not pretend to be he does not promise ever to be. Our cause, then, must be intrusted to, and conducted by, its own undoubted friends those whose hands are free, whose hearts are in the work who do care for the result. Two years ago the Republicans of the nation mustered over three hundred thousand strong. We did this under the single impulse of resistance to a common danger, with every external circumstance against us.

Of strange, discordant and even hostile elements, we gathered from the four -iyinds, and fprfneii and fought the bat- tle through, under the constant hot fire of a disciplined, proud and pampered enemy. Did we brave all #tst to falter now? now, when tliat same enemy is wavering, dissevered and belligerent '! The result is not doubtful. We shall not fail if we stand firm, we shall not Jail, Wise counsels may accelerate, or mis- takiydelay it, but, sooner or later, the victory is sure to come. tP^fiy^,

j^/ *^ f^2.y(.^'-^<^ <i?"i-^

--r^ |

T-'SKHWssi" v'vjv-'-'"^-^

mmttima SPEECH 01^ SENATOR DOUGLASj

4 A if ON THE OCCASION OF HIS I PUBLIC RECEPTION AT CHICAGy /i f>(V% Bvcmna, Jidi/ '.Hfi. 1858. Ik Mr. yoTOLAs" saidW- Mr. Clisfraan and fellow-oitzeiis : T can . tindlta-language wliioli efif'sffcquatcl.v ex- press my profound gratitude for the luagriifi- cent welcome which you have extended to me on tliis occasion. Tjiis vast sea of human faces indicates how deep an interoKt is felt by our people in tlie gj-eat iinestious whicli agi- tate the public mind, ^nd whicli underlie tlie foundations of oBy free institutions. A re- ception like this, so great in numbers that no human voice can be lieard to its countless ihousands^so enthusiastic tlvat no one indi- vidual can be the object of such enthusiasm clearly shows that there'ls some great la-inci- ple which sinks deep in the heart of the mas- ses, and involves the. riglits and the liberties of a whole people, that has brought you to- gether with a unanimity and a cordiality nuv- er before excelled, if, indeed, equalled on any occasion. I have not the vanity to believe that it is any personal compliment to me. It is an expression of your devotion to that great principle of Belf-government, to which my life for many years past iias been, and in the futiu-e will be devoted. If thers is any one principle dearer and more sacred than all others in free governments, it is that which, asserts the exclusive right of a free people lo form and adopt their own fundamental law, and to manage and regulate their own ijiter-s^ nal affairs and domestic institutions. ,f^ When. I found an effort being made during the recent session of Congress to force a fon- Rtitution upon the people of Kansas against their will, and to force that State into the Un- ion with a Constitution which her people had . rejected by more than 10,000, I felt bound as a man of honor and a representative of Illinajs, hound by every consideration of duty, of fideU ity, and of patriotisni, to resist to "the utmost of my power tlie ctonsummation <jf that fraud. With others I did

resist it, and resisted it successfully until the attempt was abandoned. We forced them to refer that Constitution bade to the people of Kansas, to be accepted or rejected as they shall decide at an election, which is fixed for the first Monday of August next. It is true that the mode of reference, and the form of the submission was not such as I could sanction with my vote, for the reason that it discriminated between free States and Slave States ; providing that if Kansas consented to come in under the Lecompton Constitution it should be received with a population of 85,000; but that if she demanded another Constitution, more consistent with the sentiments of her people and their feelings, that it should not be received into the Union until she has 99,420 inhabitants. I did not consider that mode of submission fair, for the reason that any election is a mockery which is not free that any election is a fraud upon the right of the people which holds out inducements for affirmative votes, and threatens penalties for negative votes. But whilst I was not satisfied with the mode of submission, whilst I resisted it to the last, demanding a fair, a just, a free mode of submission, still, when the law passed placing it within the power of the people of Kansas at that election to reject the Lecompton Constitution, and then make another in harmony with their principles and their opinions, I did not believe that either the penalties on the one hand, or the inducements on the other, would I force that people to accept a Constitution to which they are irreconcilably opposed. All I can say is, that if their votes can be controlled by such considerations, all the sympathy which has been expended upon them has been misplaced, and all the efforts that have been made in defence of their right to self-government have been made in an unworthy cause. Hence, my friends, I regard the Lecompton battle as having been fought and the victory won, because the arrogant demand for the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution unconditionally, whether her people wanted it or not, has been abandoned, and the principle which recognizes the right of the people to decide for themselves has been submitted to its place. Fellow-citizens: Whilst I devoted my best energies all my energies, mental and physical to the vindication of the great principle, and whilst the result has been such as will enable the people of Kansas to come into the Union, with such a constitution as they desire, yet the credit of this great moral victory is to be divided among a large number of men of various and different political creeds. I was rejoiced when I found in this great contest the Republican party coming up manfully and sustaining the principle that the people of each territory, when coming into the Union, have the right to decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits, I have seen the time when that principle was controverted. I have seen the time when all parties did not recognize the right of a people to have slavery or freedom, to tolerate or prohibit slavery, as they deemed best; but claimed that power for Congress of the United States, regardless of the wishes of the people to be affected by it, and when I found upon the Crittenden Montgomery bill the Republicans and Americans of the North, and I may say, too, some glorious Americans and old line Whigs from the South, like Crittenden and his patriotic associates, joined with a portion of the Democracy to carry out and vindicate the right of the people to decide whether slavery should

or should not exist within the limits of Kansas, I was rejoiced within my secret soul, for I saw an indication that the American people, when they come to understand the principle' would give it their cordial support. ^ The Crittenden-Montgomery bill was as fair and as perfect an exposition of the doctrine of popular sovereignty as could be carried out by any bill that man ever devised. It proposed to refer the Lecompton Constitution back to the people of Kansas, and give them the right to accept or reject it as they pleased at a fair election, held in pursuance of law, and in the event of their rejecting it and forming another in its stead, to permit them to come into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. It was fair and just in all 'of its provisions! I gave it my cordial support, and was rejoiced when I found that it passed the House of Representatives, and at one time I entertained high hope that it would pass the Senate. I regard the great principle of popular sovereignty as having been vindicated and made triumphant in this land as a permanent rule of public policy in the organization of territories and the admission of new States. Illinois took her position upon this principle many years ago. You all recollect that in 1800, after the passage of the Compromise measures of that year, when I returned to my home there was great dissatisfaction expressed at my course in supporting those measures. I appeared before the people of Chicago at a mass meeting, and vindicated each and every one of those measures; and by reference to my speech, on that occasion, which was printed and circulated broadcast throughout the State at the time, you will find that I then and there said that those measures were all founded upon the great principle that every people ought to possess the right to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, and that that right being possessed by the people of the States, I saw no reason why the same principle should not be extended to all of the territories of the United States. A general election was held in this State a few months afterwards, for members of the Legislature, pending which, all these questions were thoroughly canvassed and discussed, and the nominees of the different parties instructed in regard to the wishes of their constituents upon them. When that election was over, and the Legislature assembled, they proceeded to consider the merits of those compromise measures and the principles upon which they were predicated. And what was the result of their action? They passed resolutions, first repealing the Wilmot proviso instructions, and in lieu thereof adopted another resolution, in which they declared the great principle which asserts the right of the people to make their own form of government and establish their own institutions. That resolution is as follows: Resolved, That our liberty and independence are based upon the right of the people to form for themselves such a government as they may choose; that this great principle, the birth-right of freemen, the gift of Heaven, secured to us by the blood of our ancestors, ought to be extended to future generations, and no limitation ought to be applied to this power in the organization of any territory of the U. S. of either Territorial Government or State Constitution provided the Government so established shall be Republican, and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States. That resolution, declaring the great principle of self-government as applicable to the Territories and new States, passed the House

of Representatives of this State by a vote of sixty-one in the affirmative, to only four in the negative. Thus you find that an expression of public opinion, enlightened, enlightened, intelligent public opinion on this question by the representatives of Illinois, in 1851, approaches nearer to unanimity than has ever been obtained on any controverted question. That resolution was entered on the journal of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, and it has remained there from that day to this, a standing instruction to her Senators and a request to her Representatives in Congress, to carry out that principle in all future cases. Illinois therefore stands pre-eminent as the State which stepped forward early and established a platform applicable to this slavery question, concurred in alike by Whigs and Unionists, in which it was declared to be the wish of our people that thereafter the people of the Territories should be left perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions

'4> ^ ^UPPn

i.

I will tell their own story, and I will tell the limitation should be placed upon that right in any form. ^ Hence what was my duty, in 1851 when it became necessary to bring forward a bill for the organization of the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska? Was it not my duty, in obedience to the Illinois platform, to your standing instructions to your Senators, adopted with almost entire unanimity, to incorporate in that bill the great principle of self-government, declaring that it was "the true intent and meaning of the act not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, or to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States?" I did incorporate that principle in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and perhaps I did as much as any living man in the enactment of that bill, thus establishing the doctrine in the public policy of the country. I then defended that principle against assaults from one section of the Union. During this last winter it became my duty to vindicate it against assaults from the other section of the Union. I vindicated it boldly and fearlessly, as the people of Chicago can bear witness, when it was assailed by Free-soilers; and during this winter I vindicated and defended it as boldly and as fearlessly when it was attempted to be violated by the almost united South. I pledged myself to you on every stump in Illinois in 1854, I pledged myself to the people of other States, North and South wherever I spoke and in the United States I Senate and elsewhere, in every form in which I could reach the public mind or the public ear, I gave the pledge that I, so far as the power should be in my hands, would vindicate; the principle of the right of the people to form their own institutions, to establish free States; or Slave States as they chose, and that that principle should never be violated either by fraud, by violence, by circumvention, or by any other means, if it was in my power to prevent it. I now, submit to you my fellow-citizens,

whether I have not redeemed that pledge in "good faith i Yes, my friends, I have re- deemed it in good faith, and it, is a matter of heartfelt gratification to me to see these assem- bled thousands here to night bearing their tes- timony to the fidelity with which-fhave ad- vocated tliat principle and redeemed toy pledges in connection with it. 1 will be entirely frank witli you, My ob- ject was to secure the right of the people of each State and of each' Territory, North or South, to decide the question for themselves, to have slavery or not, just as they chose : and my opposition to the Lecompton Constitution was not predicated upon the ground that it was a pro-slavery Constiitution, nor would my action Jiave boon different had it been a free soil constitution. My .speech against the Le- compton fraud was made on the 9th of Decem- ber, while the vote on the slavery clause in that constitution was not taken until the 21.st of the same month, nearly two weeks .after. I made my speech against the lecompton monstrosity solely on the ground that it was a violation of the fundamental principles of free government: on the ground that it was not the act and deed of the'people of Kansas; that it did not embody their will; thai they were averse to it; and hence I denied the right of Congress to force it upon them, either as a free State or a slave State. I deny the right of Congress to force a slave-holding State upon an unwilling people. \ I deny their right ____yia.^'^i'cc a free State upon ;ti-unwilling peo- ple.'; I deny their right to force a good thing ____- ^flpwi a people who are unwilling to receive it. The great principle is the right of every community to judge and decide for itself, whether a thiag is right or wrong, whether it would bo good or evil for them to adopt it; and the right of free action, the right of free thought, the right of free judgment upon the question is dearer to every true American than any other under a free government. My ob- .jection to the Lecompton contrivance was that it undertook to put a Constitution on the peo- ' plo of Kansas against their will, in opposi- tion to tlieir wishes, and thus violated the great principle upon which all our institutions rest. It is no answer to tliis argument to say tliat sla.very is an evil and hence should not be tolerated. You must allowthe people to decide for themselves whether fTTTslrgood or an evil. You allow them to deciae for thera- 1^ selves whetFcr they desire a Maine Liquor law or not; y'omillow them to decide for them- selves what kind of common schools they will have ; what system of banking they will adopt, or whether they will adopt any at all; you allow them to decide for themselves the rela- tions between husband and wife, parent and child, the guardian and ward; in fact, yon allow them to decide for themselves all otior questions, and why not upon this question ? Whenever you put a limitation upon the right : of any people to decide what laws they want, ; you have destroyed the fundamental principle of self-government. -^ n connection witli this subject, perhaps, it to allude to the position of thse who have chosen to arraign my conduct on this same subject I have observed from the public prints that but, a few days ago the llepublican party of the State of Illinois assembled in convention at Springfield, and not only laid down their platform, but nominated a candi- date lor the United States Senate as my suc- cessor. I take great pleasure in saying that I have known, personally and intimately, for about a quarter of a century, the worthy gentleman who lias been nominated for my place and 1 will say that I regard him as a kind' amiable, and

intelligent gentleman, a good citizen and an honorable opponent ; and whatever issue I may have with him will be of principle, and not involving personalities. Mr. Lincoln made a speech before that Republican Convention which unanimously nominated him for the Senate a speech evidently well prepared and carefully written in which he states the basis upon which he proposes to carry on the campaign during this summer. In it he lays down two distinct propositions which I shall notice, and upon which I shall take a direct and bold issue with him. ; His first and main proposition I will give in his own language, scripture quotations and all (laughter) I give his exact language <"4 house divided against itself cannot stand" I believe this government cannot endure permanently, half slave and half free.. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved. I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect it to cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other." In other words, Mr. Lincoln asserts as a fundamental principle of this government, that there must be uniformity in the local laws and , domestic institutions of each and all the States of the Union; and he therefore invites all the non-slaveholding States to band together or- ganize as one body, and make war upon slavery in Kentucky upon slavery in Virginia, upon the Carolinas, upon slavery in all of the slave- holding States in this Union, and to persevere in that war until it shall be exterminated. He then notifies the slaveholding States to stand together as a unit and make an aggressive war upon the free States of this Union with a view of establishing slavery in them all; of forcing it upon Illinois, of forcing it upon New York upon New England, and upon every other free State, and that they shall keep up the warfare until it has been formally established in them all. In other words, Mr. Lincoln advocates boldly and clearly a war of sections, a war of the North against the South, of the free States against the slave States a war of extermination to be continued relentlessly until the one or the other shall be subdued and all the States shall either become free or become slave. Now, my friends, I must say to you frankly, that I take bold, unqualified issue with him upon that principle. I assert that it is neither desirable nor possible that there should be uniformity in the local institutions and domestic regulations of the different States of this Union. The framers of our government never contemplated uniformity in its internal concerns. The fathers of the revolution, and the sages who made the Constitution well understood that the laws and domestic institutions which would suit the granite hills of New Hampshire would be totally unfit for the rice plantations of South Carolina; they well understood that the laws which would suit the agricultural districts of Pennsylvania and New York would be totally unfit for the large mining regions of the Pacific, or the lumber regions of Maine. They well understood that the great varieties of soil, of production and , of interests, in a republic as large as this, required different local and domestic regulations in each locality, adapted to the wants and interests of each separate State, and for that reason it was provided in the Federal Constitution that the thirteen original States should remain sovereign and supreme within their own limits in regard to all that was local, and internal, and domestic, while the federal government should have certain specified powers which were general and national, and could be exercised only by the federal authority. The framers of the Constitution well understood that each locality,

having separate and ^ distinct interests, required separate and dis- i tinct laws, domestic institutions, and, police regulations adapted fo its own wants and its own condition; and they acted on the pre-
sumption, also, that these laws and institu- ' tions would be as diversified and as dissimilar as tho
States would be numeyous, and that no tw-o would be precisely laHke, because the interests of
the two would be prccigeg; 'tlIB! same. Hence, I assert, that the great fuiWa-' mental principle which
underlies our o'teiplex system of State and federal governments, con- templated diversity and
dissimilarity in the local institutions and domestic affairs of each and every State then in the Union,
or therc- aifter to be .'idmitted into the confederacy. 1

1;

__1 iMmM.is!^m!S/.,^tim, ea;fa.^-T,^ i / \.- W- f T,">"3Ti'J7JT' 'r'~.'^ ""77

r^j 'T lthereforeconceive that my friend, Mr. Lincoln, lias totally inisapprehended the great prin- ;
ciples upon which our government vests. ! Unifo.tmity in local .and domestic affairs would bo
destructive of State llights, of State .Sov- ereignty, of Personal 1/iberty and personal Freedom.
Uniformity is (he parent of Des- poti,sm the world over, not only in politics, but in religion. Wherever
the ' doctrine of Uniformity is proclaimed, that all (he Stales mnst be free or all slave, that all
labor must be white or all black, that all the citizens of the different States nuist have the same
privileges or 1)0 governed by the same regulations, you have destroyed the greatest safeguard
which our institutions have thrown around the rights of the citizen. ^ How could this imiformity be
accomplished, if it was desirable and possible ? There is but one mode in which it could be obtained,
and that must bo by abolishing the State Legisla- tures, blotting out State sovereignty, merging the
rights and sovereignty of the States in one consolidated empire, and vesting Congress with the
plenary pov/cr to make all the police regu- lations, domestic and local laws, unifoi-m throughout
the limits"of the Republic. When yon shall have done t |jis you will have unifor- miy. Then (he St^ |
Pes will all be slave or all be free ; tlien negroes will vote everywhere or nowhere ; then you will have
a Maine liquor law in every State or none; then you will have -r^ uniformKy in all things local and
domestic by S>^i l the authority of .the federal government. But *^when you attain that uniformity,
you will have converted these thirty-iwo aovereio-n, in- dopotent States, into one.consolidatyl em-
pire, with the uniformity of/<lispositioty'eim- ing triumphant throughout tlie len^h and breadth
of the land. From this view of the case, my friends, I am driven irresistably to the eonchision that
diversity, dissimilarity, variety in all our local and domestic institudons, is the great safe- guard
of our liberties; and that the framers of our institutions were wise, sagacious, and patriotic when
they made this government a confederation of sovereign States with a legis- lature for each, and
conferred upon each legislature the power to make all local and domestic institutions to suit the
people it rep- resented, without interference from any other State or from the general Congress

of the Union. If we expect to maintain our liberties we must preserve the rights and sovereignty of the States, we must maintain and carry out that great principle of self-government incorporated in the compromise measures of 1850: endorsed by the Illinois Legislature in 1851: emphatically embodied and carried out in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and vindicated this year by the refusal to bring Kansas into the Union with a Constitution distasteful to her people. The other proposition discussed by Mr. Lincoln in his speech consists in a crusade against the Supreme Court of the United States on account of the Dred Scott decision. On this question, also, I desire to say to you unequivocally, that I take direct and distinct issue with him. I have no warfare to make on the Supreme Court of the United States, either on _ account of that or any other decision which they have pronounced from that bench. The Constitution of the United States has provided that the powers of government and the Constitution of each State has the same provision shall be divided into three departments, executive, legislative, and judicial. The right and the province of expounding the Constitution, and constructing (the law, is vested in the judiciary established by the Constitution. As a lawyer, I feel at liberty to appear before the Court and controvert any principle of law while the question is pending before the tribunal; but when the decision is made, my private opinion, your opinion, all other opinions must yield to the majesty of that authoritative adjudication. I wish you to bear in mind that this involves a great principle, upon which our rights, and our liberty and our property all depend. What security have you for your property, for your reputation, and for your personal rights, if the courts are not upheld, and their decisions especially when once firmly rendered by the highest tribunal known to the Constitution? I do not choose, therefore, to go into any argument with Mr. Lincoln in reviewing the various decisions which the Supreme Court has made, either upon the Dred Scott case, or any other. I have no idea of appealing from the decision of the Supreme Court upon a Constitutional question to the decisions of a tumultuous convention. I am aware, that once an eminent lawyer of this city, now no more, said, that the State of Illinois had the most perfect judicial system in the world, subject to but one exception, which could be cured by a slight amendment, and that amendment was to so change the law as to allow an appeal from the decisions of the Supreme Court of Illinois, on all constitutional questions, to Justice of the Peace. My friend, Mr. Lincoln, who sits behind me reminds me that that proposition was made when I was Judge of the Supreme Court. But as it may, I do not think that fact adds any greater weight or authority to the suggestion. It matters not with me who was on the bench, whether Mr. Lincoln or myself, whether a Lockwood or a Smith, a Taney or a Marshall; the decision of the highest tribunal known to the Constitution or the country must be final till it has been reversed by an equally high authority. Hence, I am opposed to the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln, by which he proposes to take an appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, upon this high constitutional question to a Republican caucus sitting in the country. Yes, or any other caucus or town meeting, whether it be Republican, American, or Democratic. I respect the decisions of that august tribunal; I shall always bow in deference to them. I am a law abiding man. I will sustain the

Constitution of my country as our fathers have made it. I will yield obedience to the laws, whether I like them or not, as I find them on the statute book. I will sustain the judicial tribunals and constituted authorities in all matters within the pale of their jurisdiction as defined by the constitution. But I am equally free to say that the reason assigned by Mr. Lincoln for resisting the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case does not in itself meet my approbation. He objects to it because that decision declared that a negro descended from African parents who were brought here and sold as slaves is not, and cannot be a citizen of the United States. He says it is wrong, because it deprives the negro of the benefits of that clause of the Constitution which says that citizens of ; one State shall enjoy all the privileges and : immunities of citizens of the several States; in other words, he thinks it wrong because it deprives the negro of the privileges, immunities, and rights of citizenship, which pertain, according to that decision, only to the white man. I am free to say to you that in my opinion this government of ours is founded on the white basis. It was made by the white man, for the benefit of the white man, to be administered by white men, in such manner as ; they should determine. It is also true that a negro, an Indian, or any other man of an inferior race to a white man, should be permitted to enjoy, and humanity requires that he should have all the rights, privileges and immunities which he is capable of exercising , consistent with the safety of society. I would , give him every right and every privilege which his capacity would enable him to enjoy consistent with the good of the society in which he lived. But you may ask me what are these rights and these privileges. My answer is that each State must decide for itself the nature and extent of these rights. Illinois has decided for herself. We have decided that, the negro shall not be a slave, and we have at the ' same time decided that he shall not vote, or ! serve on juries, or enjoy political privileges. , I am content with that system of policy which we have adopted for ourselves. I deny the ' right of any other State to complain of our ' policy in that respect, or to interfere with it, or I . to attempt to change it. On the other hand, the ! State of Maine has decided that in that- State a negro man may vote on an equality with the ! white man. The sovereign power of Maine had ! the right to prescribe that rule for herself. Illinois has no right to complain of Maine for conferring the right of negro suffrage, nor has Maine any right to interfere with, or complain of Illinois because she has denied negro suffrage. The State of New York has decided by her Constitution that a negro may vote, provided i that he own \$250 worth of property, i otherwise.^ The rich negro can vote, but the i poor one cannot. Although that distinction does not commend itself to my judgment, yet I assert that the sovereign power of New York had a right to prescribe that form of the elective franchise. Kentucky, Virginia, and other States have provided that negroes, or a certain class of them in those States, shall be slaves, having neither civil or political rights. Without endorsing the wisdom of that decision, I assert that Virginia has the same power by virtue of her sovereignty to protect slavery within her limits, as Illinois has to banish it forever from our own borders. I assert the right of each State to decide for itself on all these questions and I do not subscribe to the doctrine of my friend^, Lincoln, that uniformity is either desirable or possible, I do not acknowledge that the States must all be free or must all be slave, I do

not acknowledge that, at the negro must have civil and political "rights everywhere or nowhere. I do not acknowledge that the negro must have the same rights in California that we would confer upon him here, {do not acknowledge that the Cooley importation into this country must necessarily be put upon an equality with the white race. I do not acknowledge any of these doctrines of uniformity in the local and domestic regulations in the different States.

#a^ 4 i r^

1 I k *.t, '~ 'isS.\

wtmm Uv I * i. ' \i

\ Thus you see, my fellow-citizens, that the issues between Mr. Lincoln and myself, as respective candidates for the U. S. Senate, as made plain, are direct, unequivocal, and irreconcilable, lie goes for uniformity in our domestic institutions, for a war of sections, until one or the other shall be subdued. I go for the great principle of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, the right of the people to decide for themselves. On the other point, Mr. Lincoln goes for a warfare upon the Supreme Court of the United States, because of their judicial decision in the Dred Scott case. I yield obedience to the decisions of that Court to the final determination to the highest judicial tribunal known to our constitution. He objects to the Dred Scott decision because it does not put the negro in the possession of the rights of citizenship on an equality with the white man. I am opposed to negro equality. I repeat that this nation is a white people a people composed of European descendants a people that have established this government for themselves and their posterity, and I am in favor of preserving not only the purity of the blood, but the purity of the government from any mixture or amalgamation with inferior races. I have seen the effects of this mixture of superior and inferior races this amalgamation of white men and Indians and negroes; we have seen it in Mexico, in Central America, in South America, and in all the Spanish-American States, and its result has been degeneration, demoralization, and degradation below the capacity for self-government. I am opposed to taking any step that recognizes the negro man or the Indian as the equal of the white man. I am opposed to giving him a voice in the administration of the government. I would extend to the negro, as to the Indian, and to all dependent races every right, every privilege, and every immunity consistent with the safety and welfare of the white races ; but equality they should have, either political or social, or in any other respect whatever. My friends, you see that the issues are distinctly drawn. I stand by the same platform that I have so often proclaiming to you and to the people of Illinois heretofore. I stand by the Democratic organization, yield obedience to its usages, and support its regular nominations. I endorse and approve the Cincinnati platform, and I

adhere to and intend to carry out as part of that platform, the great principle of self-government, which recognizes the right of the people in each State and Territory to decide for themselves their domestic institutions. In other words, if the Leocomp (an issue shall arise again, you have only to turn back and see which you have found me doing the last six months, and then rest assured that you will find me in the same position, battling for the same principle, and vindicating it from assault from whatever quarter it may come, so long as I have the power to do it. Fellow-citizens, you now have before you the outlines of the propositions which I intend to discuss before the people of Illinois during the pending campaign. I have spoken without preparation and in a very desultory manner, and may have omitted some points which I desired to discuss, and may have been less faithful than others than I could have wished, I have made up my mind to appeal to the people against the combination which has been made against me. The Republican leaders have formed an alliance, an unholy, unnatural alliance with a portion of the unscrupulous federal office-holders. I intend to fight that allied army wherever I meet them. I know they deny the alliance while avoiding the common purpose, but yet these men who are trying to divide the Democratic party for the purpose of electing a Republican Senator in my place, are just as much the agents, the tools, the supporters of Mr. Lincoln as if they were avowed Republicans, and expect their reward for their services when the "Jepublici" can come into power. I shall deal with these allied forces just as the Romans dealt with their allies at Sebastopol. The Russians when they fired a broadside at the common enemy did not stop to inquire whether it hit a Frenchman, an Englishman or a Turk, nor will I stop, nor shall I stop to inquire whether my blows hit the Republican leaders or their allies, who are holding the federal offices and yet acting in concert with the Republicans to defeat the Democratic party and its nominees. I do not include all of the federal office holders in this remark. Such of them as are Democrats and show their Democracy by remaining inside of the Democratic organization and supporting its nominees, I recognize as Democrats, but those who, having been defeated inside of the organization, go outside and attempt to divide and destroy the party in concert with the Republican leaders, have ceased to be Democrats, and belong to the allied army whose avowed object is to elect the Republican ticket by dividing and destroying the Democratic party. My friends, I have exhausted myself, and I certainly have fatigued you, in the long and desultory remarks which I have made. It is now two nights since I have been in bed, and I think I have a right to a little sleep. I will, however, have an opportunity of meeting you face to face, and addressing you on more than one occasion before the November election. In conclusion, I must again say to you, justice to my own feelings demands it, that my gratitude for the welcome you have extended to me on this occasion knows no bounds, and can be described by no language which I can command. I see that I am literally at home when among my constituents. This welcome has amply repaid me for every effort that I have made in the public service during nearly twenty-five years that I have held office at your lauds. It not only compensates me for the past, but it furnishes an inducement and incentive for

future effort which no man, no matter how patriotic, can feel who has not witnessed tlic magnificent reception you have extended to me to-night on my return.* I 0 /// 'mmmmmm

r Ji M^MWMn ^^ggjUilijggjlgjl iimiiiiHiM^ ^^,-iwgr _^j^^ ^ ^^ ^^y

akai ^.M DMI^ DEMOCRAT. * M *,IJ-4EJi-*>. Tuesdftyy July 13, 1868. (H:t-AepubUcon
Demonstration .ON.SAICKfIAY ET-BN1U. SPEECH OF HON. ilB4in LINCOLN, ^, IN REPLY TO SENATOR
DOITGLAS. ^J Mr. Lincoln was introduced by C. L. Wilson, Esq., and as lie made his appearance he
was greeted with a perfect storm of applause. For -ome momenta the enthusiasm continued una-
bated. At last, when by a wave of his hand pauiai silence was restored, Mr. Lincoln said: My Fellmo
Citizens .- On yesterday evening, upon the occasion of the reception given to Senator ;DougI.is, I was
furnished with a seat very convenient for hearing him, and was oth- erwise very courteously treated
by hira and his friends, and for which I thank him and them. During the course of his remarks my
name was mentioned in such a way, as I suppose renders it at least not improper that I should make
some sort of reply to him. I shall not attempt to fol- low him in the precise order in which he ad-
dressed the assembled multitude upon that oc- casion, though I shall perhaps do so in the main.
There was one question to wliich he asked the attention of the crowd, which I deem of somewhat
less importance at least of propri- ety for me to dwell upon than the others, which he brought
in near the close of his speech, and which I think it would not be entirely pi'opei:^ for me to omit
attending to 4g|p|^HI|h, and yet if I were not to give some'auentionto it now, I should probably
forget it altogether. Appfeuse . While I am upon tliis subject, al- low nie to say that 1 do not intend
to indulge in tiiat inconvenient mode aoiuetimes adopted in ' pttblie speaking, of reading from
documents; but I shall depart from tliat rule so far as to read a little scrap from his speSch, which
no- tices this iirst topic of w'hich I shall speak that is, provided I can find it in the paper, - (Examines
the Press and Tribune of this morn- I lag). A voice "(Jet out your specs." yfl have.made up my mind
'o appsal to the people agalDBt the comIjlnatioii that has been maflo against me! the Republican
leaders haviug formed an alliance, an uiihol.y and unnstural alliance, with a pcrtlon of unsoru-
puioas federal ofliee-holder.5. 1 intend to light that al- lied army wlievever I meet them. I know they
deny the alliance, bat yet thesie men who re trying to divide the democratic party for the purpose of
electing a Hepub- Hcan genalor in my place, are just as much the agents and tools of the supporters
of Mr. Lincoln. Hence I shall deal with tliis allied army just as the Rus.slans dealt with the allies at
Sebastopol that is, the Russians (lit not stop to Inquire, when they fired a liroadsirte, whether It hit
an It'nglishrnan, a Frenchman, or a Turli. Nor will I stop to inquire, nor sliall I hesitate, wliether my
blows shall hU thuse Republican leaders or iheir allies who tire holding the federal offices and ytt
acting in concert with them I Well now, gentlemen, is not that very alarm- i ing? Laughter. Just to

think of it! right at the outset of his canvass, I, a poor, kind, amiable, Intelligent, laughter gentleman, laughter and renewed cheers I am to be slain in this way. Why, my friend, the Judge, is not only, as it turns out, not a dead lion, iror even a living one he is the rugged Russian Bear ! Roars of laughter and loud applause. But if they will have it (or he says that we deny it that there is any such alliance, as he sajfs there is and I don't propose hanging very much upon tliia question of veracity but if he will have it that there is such an alliance that the Administration men and we are allied, and we stand in the attitude of English, French and , Turk, he uouupiuu the position of the Russian, i^tbat m case, 1 beg that he will indulge us while we barely suggest to hint, tliat these allies took Bebastopol. Long and tremendous applause. Gentlemen, only a lev,- more worils Hs to this alliance. For my part, I have to say, that whether there be such an alliance, depends, so far as I know, upon what may be it right defi- nition of the term aUianee. If fur the Repub- lican party to sec the other great party to which they are opposed divided among themselves, and not try to stop the division and rather be gliid of it if that is an alliance I confess I am in; but if it/^neant to be said that the Repub- licans had formed an alliance going beyond that, by which there/contribution of money or sacrifice of principle on tlie one side or the other, so far as the Republican party is con- cerned, if there lie any such thing, T protest that I neither know anything of it, nor do I believe it. 1 will however say ;ia I think this branch of the argument is lugged in I would before 1 leave it, state, for the l)ouelit of, those concerned, tliat one of those same. Buchanan men did ouce tell me of an argument that he tnadt! (or his opposition to Judge Douglas, lie said that a friend of our Senator Douglas had bt'en talking to him, and had among other things .said to him ; "Why, you don't want to beat Douglas?" "Yes," said he "1 do want to beat him, and I will tell you wltly. I believe his original Nebraska bill was right in the abstract, but it was wrong in the time that was brought X'^Y

^.- '~^ ^* y V^ e;cxA^j%^^^^^ 1^ 4^ torwatd. it was wrong in the application to a territory m regard to wiieh the question h:id been settled ; it was brought forward at a time when nobody asked him ; it was tendered to the South when the South had not asked for it btit when fhey could not well refuse it; and for this same reason lie forced that question upon our party ; it has sunk the best men all over the nation, everywhere; and now when our Presi- dent, struggling with the dificalties of this man's getting up, has reached the verv liardest point to turn in the tase, he deserts him, and i am lor putting him where he will trouble us no more." Applause.J Now, gentlemen, that is not my argument Vi^ that is not a*.argnraent at ali. I liave only been stating to you the argument of a Buchanan man. You will judge if there is any force in it. (Applause.) Popular sovereignty I everlasting popular sovereignty ! (Laughter and continued cheers.) Let us for a moment inquire into tliis vast mat- ter of popular sovereignty. What is popular sovei'eignty ? We recollect thau at an early pe- riod in the history of this struggle, there" was another name for tlie same thing ^Sijualtr Sov- axiynity. It was not exactly Popular Sovereign ty but Squatter Sovereignty. What do tho.9e -terms meau ? Wht do tlrose terms mean when used now > And vast oredit is taken by our friend, the Judge, in

regard to his support of it, when Ue declares the las), j^ears of his life have been, and all the future years of his life sh;'.il be, devoted to this iuitter of popular sovereignty. What is iff Why, it is the sovereignty of tlie peopk ! VS^hat was Squatter Sovereignty? I suppose if it had any signilicanee at all it was J^*^light of the people to govern themselves, to . oe sovei-eign of their tjwn afftiirs while they were squatted dow* in a country not their owu,while thsy had squatted on a territoiy that did not be long to them, in the sense thiit a Stute belongs to the people who iuhaliit ii when it belonged to the nation such right to govern themselves was called " Squatter Sovereignty." Now I wish you to mark. What has become of that Squatter Sovereignty ? What has be- come of it? ('an you get anybody to tell you now that tlie people of a territory have any au thority to govern themselves, in regard to ttiis mooted question of Slavery, before they forru a State Constitution V So such thing at all, al- though there is a general running fire, and al- though there has been a hurrah made in every speech on that side, assuming that policy had given the people of a territoiy the right to gov- ern thenisolvcd upon thisqtiestion : yet tlie point is dodged. Today it has been decided no more than afyear ago it was decided by the Supreme iJtmrt of the United States, and is insisted'upon t;-day, that the people of a territory have no 1 ight to oxulude Sla.very from a territory, that if any one man chooses to take slaves into a ter- ritory, all the rest of the people have no right to kaop tnem out. This being so, and this decision being made one of the points that the Judge ap- proved, and one in the approval of which he says he means to keep me down putjie down put me down I shouil notaay, for 1 have never been up. lie says he is in favor of it,and sticks to it, and expects to win his battle on that de- cision, which says that there is no such thing as Squatter Sovereignty ; but that any one man may take slaves into a territory, and all the other men iu the territory may be opposed to it, and yet by reason of the constitution they Ciitt- not prohibit it. When that is so, how much is left of this vast matter of Squatter Sovereignty 1 should like to know ? (a voice) " it has all gone." When we get back, we get to tlie point of the right of the people to make a constitution. Kan- sas was settled, for example, in 1851. It was a territory yot, without having formed a Constitut tion, iu a very regular way, for three years. All this time negro slavery could be taken in by any few individuals, and by that decision of the Su- preme Court, which the Judge approves, all the rest of the people cannot keep it out: but when they come to make a Constitution they may say they will not have Slavery. But it is there; they are obliged to tolerate it some way, and all ex- lieience shows it will be so for they will not take tile negro slaves and absolutely deprive the . owners of them. All experience shows this lobe so. All that space of time that runs front the beginning of the settlenient of the Terril^ory un- til there is sufficiency of people to make a State Constitution all that portion of time popular sovereignty is given up. The seal is absolutely put down upon it by the Court decision, and Jud.e;e Douglas puts his own upon tlie top of that, yet he is appealing to the people to give him vast credit for his devotion to popular sovereign- ty. (Applause.) Again, when we ^et to the que.-?tion of the right of tlie people to

form a State Constitution as they please, to form it with Slavery or without Slavery if that is anything new, I confess

jj3aa'-. - -! tiT mhiftf" T*firilf(ff#-ti

lr i """"ill';;""""-' ^""i.'n;^

I I I don't know it. Has there ever been a time when anybody said that any other than the people of a Territory itself should form a Constitution? What is now in it, that Judge Douglas should have fought several years of his life, and pledge himself to fight all the remaining years of his life for? Can Judge Douglas find any body on earth that said that anybody else should form a constitution for a people? (A voice, "Yes.") Well, I should like you to name him; I should like to know who he was. (Same voice "John Calhoun.") / Mr. Lincoln No, sir, I never heard of even John Calhoun saying such a thing. He insisted on the same principle as Judge Douglas; but his mode of applying it in fact, was wrong. It is enough for my purpose to ask this crowd, when ever a Republican said anything against it? They never said anything against it, but they have constantly spoken for it; and whosoever will undertake to examine the platform, and the speeches of responsible men of the party, and of irresponsible men, too, if you please, will be unable to find one word from anybody in the Republican ranks, opposed to that Popular Sovereignty which Judge Douglas thinks that he has invented. Applause. I suppose that Judge Douglas will claim in a little while, that he is the inventor of the idea that the people should govern themselves: cheers and laughter; that nobody ever thought of such a thing until he brought it forward. We do remember, that in that old Declaration of Independence, it is said that "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." There is the origin of Popular Sovereignty. Loud applause. Who, then, shall come in at this day and claim that he invented it. Laughter and applause. The Lecompton Constitution connects itself with this question, for it is in this matter of the Lecompton Constitution that our friend Judge Douglas claims such vast credit. I agree that in opposing the Lecompton Constitution so far as I can perceive, he was right. "Good," "good." I do not deny that at all; and gentlemen, you will readily see why I could not deny it, even if I wanted to. But I do not wish to; for all the Republicans in the nation opposed it, and they would have opposed it just as much without Judge Douglas' aid, as with it. They had all taken ground against it long before he did. Why, the reason that he urges against that Constitution, I urged against him a year before. I have the printed speech in my hand. The argument that he makes, why that Constitution should not be adopted, that the people were not fairly represented nor allowed to vote. I pointed out in a speech a year ago, which I hold in my hand now, that no fair chance was to be given to the people.

"Read it," read it." I shall not waste your time by trying to read it. " Read it," " read it." Gentlemen, reading from speeches is a very tedious business, particularly for an old man that has to put on spectacles, and the more so if the man be 50 tall that he has to bend over to the light. Laughter. A little more, now, as to this matter of popular sovereignty and the Leecompton Constitution. The Leecompton Constitution, as the Judge tells us, was defeated. The defeat of it was a good thing or it was not. He thinks the defeat of it was a good thing, and so do I, and we agree in that. Who defeated it? A voice Judge Douglas. Mr. Lincoln rises, he hunched himself, and if you suppose he controlled the other Democrats that went with him, he furnished three votes, while the Republicans furnished thirty. Applause. That is what he did to defeat it. In the House of Representatives he and his friends furnished some twenty votes, and the Republicans furnished thirty odd. Loud applause. Now who was it that did the work? A voice Douglas. Mr. Lincoln Why, yes, Douglas did it! To be sure he did. Let us, however, put that proposition another way. The Republicans could not have done it without Judge Douglas. Could he have done it without them. Applause. Which could have come the nearest to doing it without the other? Renewed applause. "That's it," " that's it;" " good," " good." A voice Who killed the bill? Another voice Douglas. Mr. Lincoln Ground was taken against it by the Republicans long before Douglas did it. The proportion of opposition to that measure is about five to one. A Voice " Why don't they come out on it?" Mr. Lincoln You don't know what you are talking about, nay sir; no. I am quite willing to answer any gentleman in the crowd who asks an honorable question. Great applause. Now, who in all this country has ever found any of our friends of Judge Douglas' way of thinking, and who have acted upon this main question, has ever thought of uttering a word in behalf of Judge Trumbull? A voice " we have." I defy you to show a printed resolution passed in a Democratic meeting I take it upon myself to defy any man to show a printed resolution of a Democratic meeting, large or small, in favor of Judge Trumbull, or any of the five to one Republicans who beat that bill. Every thing must be for the Democrats! They did every thing, and the five to one that really did the thing, they snub over, and they do not seem to remember that they have an obligation upon the face of the earth. Applause. Gentleman: I fear that I shall become tedious, (Go on, go on.) I leave this branch of the subject to take hold of another. I take up that part of Judge Douglas' speech in which he respectfully attended to me. (Laughter.) Judge Douglas made two points upon my recent speech at Springfield. He says they are to be the issues of this campaign. The first one of these points he bases upon the language in a speech which I delivered at Springfield which I believe I can quote correctly from memory. I said there that "we are now far into the fifth year since a policy was instituted for the avowed object and with the confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation under the operation of that policy," that agitation had only not ceased, but has constantly augmented." (A voice)~"It's the very language." "I believe it will not cease Until a crisis shall have been reached and passed A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." (Applause.) "I do not expect the Union to be dissolved" "I am quoting from my speech "I do not expect the

liouse to fall, hut 1 do expect if will cease to be divided, It will become all one tiling or the other. Kither the opponents of slavery will arrest the spread of it, and iplace it where the public mind shall rest in the helief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, ^or its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States,North as well as South." (Good, good.) What is the paragraph. Is tMs paragraph which I have,quoted in your hearing, and to which I ask the attention of all. Judge 6oug- las thiuks lie di-covers great political heresy. 1 want your attention particularly to what he has inferred from it. He says 1 am in favor of making all the States of this Union uniform in all their internal regulations ; that in all their tlomestio concerns I ain in favor of making them entirely uniform. He draws this infer- ence f'om the language 1 have quoted to ,you. He says that 1 am in favor of making war by the North upon the South for the extinction of slavery ; that lam also in favor of invitinig (as he expresses it) the South to a war upon the North, for the purpose of nationalizing slavery. Now, it is singular enough, if you will carefully read that passage over, that I "did uot say tiiatl was in favor of anything in it. I only \ said what I expected would take place. 1 ma| ie a prediction only it may have been a foolish one perhaps. I did not even say that I desired that slavery should be put in course of ultimate ex'- tinction. I do say so now, however, (great ap- plause) so there need be no longer any difficul- ty about that. It may be written down iii the great speech. (Applause and laughter.) Gentlemen, Judge Douglas informed youthat this speech of mine was probably carefully,pre- pared. I admit thai it was. I am not liikster of language ; 1 have not a fine education ; 1 am not capable of entering into a disquisition upon dialectics, as I believe you call it; but I do uot believe the language I employed bears anv such construction as Judge Douglas put upon it. But I don't care about a quibble in regard to words. I know what f meant, and 1 will not leave this crowd in doubt, if I can explain it to them, what 1 really meant in the use of that para- graph. I am not, in the first place, unaware that this Govcrnineut has endured eighty-two years, half slave ,unl half free. I know t'hat. 'I am toler- ably well acquainted with the history of the country, and 1 know that it has endured eighty- two years, half slave and half free. I bd'Mje and that is what I meant to allude to there I bdieoe it has endured because, during all that time, until the introduction of the Nebraska Bill, the public mind did rest, all the time, in the belief that slavery was in eourae of ulti- mate extinction. ("Good !" "Good I" and ap. plause.) That was what gave us the rest that we had through that period of eighty-two year.i; at least, so I believe. I have always hated slavery, I think as miu-h as any Abolitionist. (Applause.) I have been an Old Line Whig. I have always hated it, but 1 have always been quiet about it until tins new era of the intro- duction of the Nebraska Bill began. I always believed that everybody was against it, and that it was in course of ultimate extinction. (Pointing to Mr. Browning, who stood nearby.) Browning thought so; the great mass of the Ill

1 t =335*1 nmKmimamtl.. HijMjlil. MMIMilMMMMNM a ^^mm^'

L-MtaMMuriMAi nation have rested in tha belief that slayery w3 in eoui'se of ultimate extinction. They had reason so to belieye. The adoption ol the Constitution and its at- tendaiii history led the people to belieTeso; and that sooh waa the belief of the Iramera of the Ooustitutioii itself. Why did those uld men, about the time of the adoption of the Ooiistitu- tiuii, decree tliat Slavery should not go into the new Tc'fitory, where it had not already gone ? Why declare lliat within twenty years the Afri- can Slave Trade, by whicii slaves are supplied, niiglit be cut oft'by Congress? Why were all tliese acts ? I might enumerate more of these acta but enough. What were they but a clear indication that tlie f'ramers ol the Consti- tution intended and eipeeted the ultimate ex- tinction of that institution. Cheera.J And now, when I say, as I said in my speech that Judge Douglas has quoted from, when I say that I think the opponents of slavery will re- sist the farther spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest with the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction, I only mean to say, that they will place it where the founders of this Government originally placed it. I have said a hundred times, and I have now no inclination to take it back, that I believe there is no right, and ought to be no incUnation in the people of the free States to enter into the slave States, and interfere with the question of slavery at all. I have said that always. Judge Douglas ha.s heard me say it if not quite a hundred times, at least as good as a hundred times; and when it iSBaid that I am in favor 01 interfering with slavery where it exists, I know it is unwarranted by anything I have ever intmded, and, as I believe, by anything I have ever said. If, by any means, I have ever used language which could fairly be so construed, (as, however, I believe I never have,) I now correct it. Here the shouts of tlie Seventh Ward Dele- gation announced that they were eoming in procession. They were received with enthu- siastic cheers. So much, then, for the inference that Judge Douglas draws, that I am in favor of setting the sections at war witir, one another. I know that I never meant any such thing, and I be- lieve that no fair mind can infer any such thing from anything I have ever said. ("Good," "good,") Now in relation to his inference that I am in favor of a general consolidation of all the local institutions of the various States. I will at- tend to that for a little while, and try to in- quire, if I can, how ou earth it could be that any man could draw such an inference from anything I said. I have said, very many times, in Judge Douglas' hearing, that no man be- lieved more than I in the principle of self-gov- ernment; that it lies at the bottom of all my ideas of just government, h-om beginning to end. I liave dented that his use of that term applies properly. But for the thing itself, I deny that any man has ever gone ahead of me in his devotion to the principle, whatever he may have done in efficiency in advocating it. I think that I have said it in your hearing that I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as lie pleases with liimself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's l'ights (applause) that each community, as a State, has a right to do exactly as it pleases with all the concerns with- in tliat State that interfere with the rights of no other State, and that the general govern- monl, upon pripciple, iiaa no right to interfere with anything other than that general class of things that does concern the whole. I have said that at all times. I

have said, as illustrations, that I do not believe in the right of Illinois to interfere with the cranberry laws of Indiana, the oyster laws of Virginia, or the lobster laws of Maine. I have said these things over and over again, and I repeat them here as my sentiments. How is it, then, that Judge Douglas infers, because I hope to see slavery put where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is the course of ultimate extinction, that I am in favor of Illinois going over and interfering with the cranberry laws of Indiana? What can authorize him to draw any such inference? I suppose there might be one thing that at least enabled him to draw such an inference that would not be true with me or with many others, that is, because he looks upon all this matter of slavery as an exceedingly little thing this matter of keeping one-sixth of the population of the whole nation in a state of oppression and tyranny unequalled in the world. He looks upon it as being an exceedingly little thing only equal to the question of the cranberry laws of Indiana as something having no moral question in it as something on a par with the question of whether a man shall pasture his land with cattle, or plant it with tobacco so little and so small a thing, that he concludes, if; I could desire that anything should be done to bring about the ultimate extinction of that little thing, I must be in favor of bringing about an amalgamation of all the other little things in the Union. Now, it so happens and there, I presume, is the foundation of this mistake that the Judge thinks thus; and it so happens that there is a vast portion of the American people that do not look upon that matter as being this very little thing. They look upon it as a vast moral evil; they can prove it is such by the writings of those who gave us the blessings of liberty which we enjoy, and that they so looked upon it, and not as an evil merely confining itself to the States where it is situated; and while we agree that, by the Constitution we assented to, in the States where it exists we have no right to interfere with it because it is in the Constitution, and we are by both duty and inclination to stick by that Constitution in all its letter and spirit from beginning to end. (Great applause.) So much then as to my disposition my wish to have all the State legislatures blotted out, and to have one consolidated government, and a uniformity of domestic regulations in all the States, by which I suppose it is meant if we raise corn here, we must make sugar cane grow here too, and we must make those which grow North, grow in the South. All this I suppose he understands I am in favor of doing. Now, so much for all this nonsense for I must call it so. The Judge can have no issue with me on a question of establishing uniformity in the domestic regulations of the States. But Sir, DKCISios. A little now on the other point the Dred Scott Decision. Another one of the issues he says that is to be made with me, is upon his devotion to the Dred Scott Decision, and my opposition to it. I have expressed before, and I now repeat, my opposition to the Dred Scott decision, but I should be allowed to state the nature of that opposition and I ask your indulgence while I do so. What is fairly implied by the term Judge Douglas has used "resistance to the Decision?" I do not resist it. If I wanted to take Dred Scott from his master, I would be interfering with property, and that terrible difficulty that Judge Douglas speaks of, of interfering with property, would arise. But I am doing no such thing as that, but all that I am doing is refusing to obey it as a political rule. If I

were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new territory, in spite of that Dred Scott Decision, I would vote that it should. Applause ; "good for you ;" "we hope to see it;" "that's light." Mr. Lincoln That is what I would do. "You will have a chance soon." Judge Douglas said last night, that before the decision he might advance his opinion, and it might be contrary to the decision when it was made ; but after it was made he would abide by it until it was reversed. Just so I We let this property ' abide by the decision, but we will try to reverse that decision. Loud applause cries of "good." We will try to put it where Judge Douglas would not object, for he says he will obey it until it is reversed. Somebody has to reverse that decision, since it is made, and we mean to reverse it, and we mean to do it peaceably. What are the uses of decisions of courts ? They have two uses. As rules of property they have two uses. First they decide upon the question before the court. They decide in this case that Dred Scott is a slave. Nobody resists that. Not only that, but they say to everybody else, that persons standing just as Dred Scott stands is as he is. That is, they say that when a question comes up upon another person it will be so decided again, unless the court decides in another way, cheers cries of "good," unless the court overrules its decision. Renewed applause . Well, we mean to do what we can to have the court decide the other way. That is one thing we mean to try to do. The sacredness that Judge Douglas throws around this decision, is a degree of sacredness that has never been before thrown around any other decision. I have never heard of such a thing. Why, decisions apparently contrary to that decision, or that good lawyers thought were contrary to that decision, have been made by that very court before. It is the first of its kind; it is an astonisher in legal history. Laughter. It is a new wonder of the world. Lighter applause. It is based upon falsehood in the main as to the facts allegations of facts upon which it stands are not facts at all in many instances, and no decision made on any question the first instance of a decision made under so many unfavorable circumstances thus placed has ever been held by the profession as law, and it has always needed confirmation before the lawyers regarded it as settled law. But Judge Douglas will have it that all hands must take this extraordinary decision, made under these extraordinary circumstances, and give their vote in Congress in accordance with it, yield to it and obey it in every possible sense. Circumstances alter cases. Do not gentlemen here remember the case of that day (h*^ ^" i

~:S^Jk^ ^^^ dM::^ . tl

diilait. .^w same Snpreme Court, some twenty-five or thirty years ago, deciding that a National Bank was constitutional ? I ask, if somebody does not remember that a National Bank was declared to be constitutional ? "Yes," "yes" Such is the truth, whether it be remembered or not The Bank charter ran out, and a re-charter was granted by Congress. That recharter was laid before General Jackson. It was urged upon him, when he denied the constitutionality of the bank, that the Supreme Court had decided that it was constitutional; and that General Jackson then said that the Supreme Court

had no right to lay down a rule to govern a coordinate branch of the government, the members of which had sworn to support the Constitution that each member had sworn to support that Constitution as he understood it. I will venture here to say, that I have heard Judge Douglas say that he approved of General Jackson for that act. What has now become of all his tirade about "resistance to the Supreme Court?" "Gone up," "Gone to the Theatre." My fellow citizens, getting back a little, for I pass from these points, when Judge Douglas makes his threat of annihilation upon the "alliance." He is cautious to say that that warfare of his is to fall upon the leaders of the Republican party. Almost every word he utters and every distinction he makes, has its significance. He means for the Eepublioans that do not count themselves as leaders, to be his friends; he makes no fuss over them; it is the leaders that he is making war upon. He wants it understood that the mass of the Republican party are really his friends. It is only the leaders that are doing something, that are intolerant, and that requires extermination at his hands. As this is clearly and unquestionably the light in which he presents that matter, I want to ask your attention, addressing myself to the Republicans here, that I may ask you some questions, as to where you, as the Republican party, would be placed if you sustained Judge Douglas in his present position by a re-election? I do not claim, gentlemen, to be unselfish, I do not pretend that I would not like to go to the United States Senate, (laughter), I make no such hypocritical pretense, but I do say to you that in this mighty matter, it is nothing to you nothing to the mass of the people of the nation, whether or not Judge Douglas or myself shall ever be heard of after this night, it may be a trial to either of us, but in connection with this mighty question, upon which hang the destinies of the nation, perhaps, it is absolutely nothing; but where will you be placed if you re-endorse Judge Douglas? Don't you know how apt he is how exceedingly anxious he is at all times to seize upon anything and everything to persuade you that something has done you did yourselves? Why, he tried to persuade you last night that our Illinois Legislature instructed him to introduce the Nebraska bill. There was nobody in that legislature ever thought of such a thing; and when he first introduced the bill, he never thought of it- but still he fights furiously for the proposition! and that he did it because there was a standing instruction to our Senators to be always introducing Nebraska bills. (Laughter and applause) He tells you he is for the Cincinnati platform, he tells you he is for the Dred Scott decision. He tells you, not in his speech last night, but substantially in a former speech, that he cares not if slavery is voted up or down he tells you the struggle on Lecompton is past it may come up again or not, and if it does he stands where he stood when in spite of him and his opposition you built up the Republican party. If you endorse him you tell him you do not care whether slavery be voted up or down, and he will close, or try to close your mouths with his declaration repeated by the day, the week, the month and the year. Is that what you mean? (cries of "no," one voice "yes.") Yes, I have no doubt you who have always been for him if you mean that. No doubt of that (a voice "hit him again") soberly I have said, and I repeat it I think in the position in which Judge Douglas stood in opposing the Lecompton Constitution he was right, he does not know that it will return, but if it

does we may know where to find him, and if it does not we may know where to look for him and that is on the Cincinnati platform. Now I could ask the Republican party after all the hard names that Judge Douglas has called them by all his repeated charges of their inclination to marry with and hug negroes all his declarations of Black Republicanism by the way we are improving, the black has got rubbed off but with all that, if he be endorsed by Republican votes where do you stand? Plainly you stand ready saddled, bridled and harnessed and waiting to be driven over to the slavery extension camp of the nation a voice "we will hang ourselves first" -just ready to be driven over tied together in a lot to be driven over, every man with a rope around his neck, that halter being held by Judge Douglas. That is the question. If Republican men have been in earnest in what they have done, I think they had better not do it, but I think that the Republican party is made up of those who, as far as they can peaceably, will oppose the extension of slavery, and who will hope for its ultimate extinction. If they believe it is wrong in grasping up the new lands of the continent^ and keeping them from the settlement of free white laborers, who want the land to bring up their families upon; if they are in earnest, although they may make a mistake, they will grow restless,, and the time will come when they will come back again Bud re-organize, if not by the same name, at least upon the same principles as their party now has. It is better, then, to save the work while it is begun. You have done the labor; maintain it keep it. If men choose to serve you, go with them; but as you have made up your organization upon principle, stand by it; for, as surely as God reigns over you, and has inspired your mind, and given you a sense of propriety, and continues to give you hope, so surely you will still cling to these ideas, and you will at last come back again after your wanderings, merely to do your work over again. Loud applause. We were often more than once at least in the course of Judge Douglas' speech last night, reminded that this government was made for white men that he believed it was made for white men. Well, that is putting it into a shape in which no one wants to deny it, but the Judge then goes into his passion for drawing inferences that are not warranted. I protest, now and forever, against that counterfeit logic which presumes that because I did not want a negro woman for a slave, I do necessarily want her for a wife. (Laughter and cheers.) My undivided standing is that I need not have her for either, but, as God made us separate, we can leave one another alone and do one another good thereby, There are white men enough to marry all the white women, and enough black men to marry all the black women, and in God's name let them be so married. The Judge regales us with the terrible enormities that take place by the mixture of races; that the inferior race bears the superior down. Why, Judge, if we do not let them get together in the Territories they won't mix there. (Immense applause.) A voice "Three cheers for Lincoln." (The cheers were given with a hearty good will.) Mr. Lincoln I should say at least that it is a self evident truth. Now, it happens that we meet together once* every year, sometime about the 4th of July, for some reason or other. These 4th of July gatherings I suppose have their uses. If you will indulge me, I will state what I suppose to be some of them. We are now a mighty nation, we are thirty__ or about thirty millions of people, and we own and inhabit about one-fifteenth part of the dry land of



the whole earth. We run our memory back over the pages of history for about eighty-two years and we discover that we were then a very small people in point of numbers, vastly inferior to what we are now, with a vastly less extent of country, with vastly less of every thing we deem desirable among men, we look upon the change as exceedingly advantageous to us and to our posterity, and we fix upon something that happened away back, as in some way or other being connected with this rise of prosperity. We find a race of men living in that day whom we claim as our fathers and grandfathers; they were iron men, they fought for the principle that they were contending for; and we understood that by what they then did it has followed that the degree of prosperity that we now enjoy has come to us. We hold this annual celebration to remind ourselves of all the good done in this process of time of how it was done and who did it, and how we are historically connected with it; and we go from these meetings in better humor with ourselves we feel more attached the one to the other, and more firmly bound to the country we inhabit. In every way we are better men in the age, and race, and country in which we live for these celebrations. But after we have done all this we have not yet reached the whole. There is something else connected with it. We have besides these men descended by blood from our ancestors among us perhaps half our people who are not descendants at all of these men they are men who have come from Europe—German, Irish, French and Scandinavian men that have come from Europe themselves, or whose ancestors have come hither and settled here, finding themselves our equals in all things. If they look back through this history to trace their connection with those days by blood, they find they have none, they cannot carry themselves back into that glorious epoch and make themselves feel that they are part of us, but when they look through that old Declaration of Independence they find that those old men say that "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," and then they feel that that moral sentiment taught in that day evidences their relation to those men, that it is the father of all moral principle in them, and that they have a right to claim it as though they were blood of the blood, and flesh of the flesh of the men who wrote that Declaration, (loud and long continued applause) and so they are. That is the electric cord in that Declaration—

„jiiU'.J 1 : ""F,'WBIW BBSS-"- "" "" 'i-'W^^

I ^ hf r-" M7 i lou that Imka the hearts ot pauiouc and JiL=r i ty-loyiug men together, that will link those pa- triouc hearts as long as the love of freedom ex- ists m the minds of men throughout the world. (Applause.) I .Now,_sir3, for the purpose of squaring things with this Idea of " don't care if slavery Is voted up or voted down," ior sustaining the Dred Scott decision A voice-" Hit him again" , for hold- ing that the Declaration of Independence did not mean anything at all, we have Judge Douglas giving his exposition of what the Declaration of Independence means, and we have him savin.' that the people of America are equal to the people ot England. According to his construc- tion, you Germans are not connected with it. isow I ask you in all soberness, if all these things il indulged

ill, if ratified, if confirmed and endorsed. If taught to our children, and repeated to them, do not tend to rub out the sentiment of liberty in the country, and to transform this government into a government of some other form. Those arguments that are made, that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow. What are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world, you will find that all the arguments in favor of king-craft were of this class; they always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the Judge is the same old serpent that says you work and I eat your toil and I will enjoy the fruits of it. Turn in whatever way you will whether it come from the mouth of a King, an excuse for enslaving the people of his country, or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent, and I hold if that course of argumentation that is made for the purpose of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this, should be granted, it does not stop with the negro. I should like to know if taking the old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle and making exceptions to it where will it stop. If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? If that declaration is not the true truth, let us get the Statute book, in which we find it, and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it! I hear voices "me," "no one," &c.) If it is not true let us tear it out! cries of "no no" "I let us stick to it then, let us stand firmly by it then. Applause. It may be argued that there are certain conditions that make necessities and impose them upon us, and to the extent that a necessity is imposed upon a man he must submit to it. I think that was the condition in which we found ourselves when we established this government. We had slavery among us, we could not get our constitution unless we permitted them to remain. If slavery, we could not secure the good we did secure if we grasped for more, and having by necessity submitted to that much, it does not destroy the principle that is the charter of our liberties. Let that charter stand as our standard. - ^ My friend has said to me that I am a poor hand to quote Scripture. I will try it again, however. It is said in one of the admonitions of our Lord, "As your Father in Heaven is perfect, be ye also perfect." The Savior, I suppose, did not expect that any human creature could be perfect as the Father in Heaven; but He said, "As your Father in Heaven is perfect, be ye also perfect." He set that up as a standard, and he who did most towards reaching that standard, attained the highest degree of moral perfection. So I say in relation to the principle that all men are created equal, let it be as nearly reached as we can. If we cannot give freedom to every creature, let us do nothing that will impose slavery upon any other creature. - ^ (Applause.) Let us then turn this government back into the channel in which the framers of the Constitution originally placed it. Let us stand firmly by each other. , If we do not do so we are turning in the contrary direction, that our friend Judge Douglas proposes not intentionally as working in the traces tend to make this one universal slave nation. (A voice---"It is so.") lie is one that runs in that direction, and as such I

resist him. My friends, I have detained you about as long as I desired to do, and I have only to say, let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position discard- ing our standard that we have left us. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall oucho more stand up declaring that all men are created equal. My friends, I could not, without launching off upon some new topic, which would detain you too long, continue to-night. (Cries of "goon.") I thank you for this most extensive audience that you have furnished me to-night. I leave you, hoping that the lamp of liberty will burn in your bosoms until there shall no longer be a doubt that all men are created free and equal. Mr. Lincoln retired amid a perfect torrent of applause and cheers. ^^ j^ ll

Sifem'a

/^Xj2-i2_&-A^X^~ iji p. ~jr'..MW,^TT-p*-,^--^ --f^

E1S*i5V*KiW3ii-gS :i

SPEECH JI'.V.h'ro':. :k:::-^-. i-^Vjr : i ,>(; -rij 7'r^ . ' ' --,1 .--.-, - ;> J.ICji ' "13 SEMTOR DOFems IV ji.^i.r .vf.ij U-i z^ihia : \ e. D^Hvered atBlobmingtoa/iu., Ji^y 16tli, 1858. ;!;^ og tSBfja t/ci'p\ . U^i-f u a -ill iH'-i

,: , . ->;>3i-p ' . lli 'i 'rrd aov -io: ::c>i.t.=i9ii') ,, '-.-. / ^, ;"*SENATOR I^^LAS saad^~iy'w!-V. -ij^g oj ui^:-
r .jii''' ' " ii : t^?-' , ^ | .%a.anaieilow'(;itiz^ns' of'kcLean county-^tift say that I am kind and complimentary
sentiments jou have expressea towards toe is buta , feeble expression of the feelings of my heart ^
- "-wdius, me is Dut,a ^ ^d ^P^^"" , ^?ff yo this evening for th? purpose'of vindicating the course I the
great public questions which have agitated the country since I last ad- only by political foes,'.but by. a
few men pretending to belong to tie Demo- ' . cratic party, and yet actitig in alliance with the 'enemies
of that^par y forThe purpose of elecclng Republicansto Congress in this State, in H kcf e of'the nre-
sent D^ocratic delegation. I desire y5nr attention whilst I E^yo^^M then T will aslr your verdict,
whether lhave not in allthings'acted'in entire lvowa'Si^h'r'^f f ir^'^^"" the principles, the proLsiSJCd S
avowalB which I made before my: constituterits, previous to m^ going to the ;" , \S"f , ^e1ast^es^ion
of Con^res^, thdgreat question of controversy has bfeen the admission'of Kansasinto'theUnion
undet the Lecomntoh CohSion ' Mv inton f^ .?, f ^ ^ i'TI' opposit on to thdt Lecompton Constitution.
' S nHf^ S ^'^t^o'-^e:is contained ih the' fact that'that instrument S T Hn?/ .. " ^ ^f ?^ ^ *^ P'^^: of
Kansa8,bnd did not embody their will. 1 no d lt to be a fnndamentarprinciple in all free governments
a crin- SStE" T ?^^^ ^i Lep^denC, and iS^^te ffl- 'Sik^^ ' tK > ^""^^Sta es, as well as the, Constitubn
of every ^State of the ?i'?f-*M.Pm people ought to have-the right to foVn,, adopt and ratify the
Constitution under which they are to live. ' (" ood, | ood " and thS t^Sn .^Jl"/:if educed the Wka bill

in^ the Senatof'the UnS ' Z^n^/u L tj^ ' ',* to. legislate sl^ery into any Territory or State, or to > exclude ittberfefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form LI regulate their own domestic institutions in'their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. (" That's the doctrine.") In that bill the pledge was distinctly made that the people of Kansas should be left not only free, but perfectly free to form and regulate their own domestic institution to suit themselves ; and the question arose, when the Lecompton Constitution was sent into Congress, and the admission of Kansas not only asked, but at- tempted to be forced under it, whether or not that Constitution was the free act and deed of the people of Kansas? No man pretends that it embodied their will. Every man in America knows that it was rejected by the people of Kansas, by a majority of over ten thousand, before the attempt was made in Congress to force the Territory into the Union under that Constitution I ^ resisted, therefore, the Lecompton Constitution because it was a violation of the great principle of self-government, upon which all our institutions rest I do not wish to mislead you, or to leave you in doubt as to the motives of my action. I did not oppose the Lecompton Constitufon upon the ground of the slavery clause contained in it. I made my speech against that instrument be- fore the vote was taken on the slavery clause. At the time I made it I did not know whether that clause would be voted in or out; whether it would be included m the Constitufon, or excluded from it, and it made no difference ! with me what the result of the vote was, for the reason that I was contending for a principle, under which you have no more right to force a free State upon a people against their will, than you have to foroe a slave State upon them without their consent. (Great enthusiasm.) The error consisted in attempt- ing to control the free action of the people of Kansas in any respect whatever It IS BO argument with me to say that such and such a clause of the Constitu- tion was not palatable, that you did not like it ; it is a matter of no conse- quence whether you m Illinois like any clause in the Kansas Constitution or not; It IS not a question for you, but it is a question for the people of Kansas. Ibey have the right to make a Constitution in accordance with their own wishes and if you do not like it you are not bound to go there and live unda- It. We in Illinois have made a Constitution to suit ourselves, and we t.hink we naye a tolerably good one ; but whether we have or not, it is nobody's busi- ness but our own. If the people in Kentucky do not like it, they need not come here to live under it ; if the people of Indiana are not satisfied with it what matters it to us.? We, and we alone, have the right to a voice in its adoption or rejection. Reasoning thus, my friends, my efforts were directed to tlle vindication of the great principle involving the right of the people of each State and each Territory to form and regulate their own domestic institutions to suit themselves, subject only to the Constitution of our common country. (Applause.) 1 am rejoiced to be enabled to say to you that we fought that battle until we forced the advocates of the Lecompton instrument to abandon the attempt of inflicting it upon the people of Kansas, without first giving them an opportunity of rejecting it. When we compelled them to abandon that ettort, they resorte^d to a scheme. They agreed to refer the Constitution back to the

people of Kansas, thus conceding the correctness of the principle for which I had contended, and granting all I had desired, provided the mode of

/

i ^ that reference, and the mode of submission to the people had been just, fair and equal. I did not consider the mode of submission provided, in what is known as the " English" bill, a fair submissioQ, and for this simple reason, among others : It provided, in effect, that if the people of Kansas would accept the Lecomptou Constitution that they might come in with 35,000 inhabitants, but that, it they rejected it, in order that they might form a constitution agreeable to their own feelings, and conformable to their own principles, that they should not be received into the Union until they had 93,420 inhabitants. In other words, it said to the people, if you will come into the Union as a slaveholding State, you shall be admitted with 35,000 inhabitants, but if you insist on being a free State, you shall not be admitted until you have 93,420. / was not willing to discriminate between free States and slave States in this onfederacy. I will not pat a restriction upon a slave State that I would not put upon a frefe State, and I will not permit, if I can prevent it, a restriction sing put upoB a free State which i not applied with the same force to the slaveholding States. (Cheers.) Equality among the States is a cardinal and fundamental principle in our confederacy, and cannot be violated without over- turning our system of government. (Cheers.) Hence I demanded that the free States and the slaveholding States should be kept on an exact equality, one with the other, as the Constitution of the United States had placed them. If the people of Kansas want a slaveholding State, let them have it, and if they want a free State they have a right to it, and it is not for the people of Illinois or Missouri, or New York, or Kentucky, to complain, whatever the decision of the people of Kansas may be upon that point. '--T^Sut while I was not content with the mode of submission contained in e English bill, and while I could not sanction it for the reason that in my opinion it violated the great principle of equality among the different States, yet when it became the law of the land, and under it the question was referred back to the people of Kansas for their decision at an election to be held on the first Monday in August next, I bowed in deference, because whatever decision the people shall make at that election must be final and conclusive of the whole question. If the people of Kansas accept the proposition submitted by Con- gress, from that moment Kansas will become a State of the Union and there is no way of keeping her out if you should try. The act of admission would then become ir repealable; Kansas would be a State, and there would be an end of the controversy. On the other hand, if at that election the people of Kansas shall reject the proposition, as it is now generally thought will be the case, from that moment the Lecompton Constitution is dead, and again there is an end of the controversy. So you see that either way, on the 3d of August next, the Lecompton controversy ceases and terminates forever ; and a similar question can never arise unless some man shall attempt to play the Lecompton game over

again. But my fellow citizens I am well convinced that that game will never be attempted again ; it has been,80 solemnly and thoroughly rebuked___ 'during the last session of Congress that it will find it but few advocates in the future. The President of the United States in his annual message expressly recommends that the example of the Minnesota case, wherein Congress required the Constitution to be submitted to the vote of the people for ratification or rejection, shall be followed in all future cases; (Good !!) and all we have to do is to sustain as one man that recommendation, and the Kansas controversy can never again arise. My friends, I do not desire you to understand me as claiming for myself any special merit for the course I have pursued on this question. I simply did my duty, a duty enjoined by fidelity, by honor, by patriotism; a duty which I could not have shrunk from in my opinion without dishonor and faithlessness to my constituency. Besides I only did what it was in the power of any one man to do. There were others, men of eminent ability, men of wide reputation renowned all over America who led the van and are entitled to the greatest share of the credit. Foremost among them all, as he was ahead and shoulders above them all, was Kentucky's great and gallant statesman, John J. Crittenden. (Good, good, and cheers.) By his course upon this question he has shown himself a worthy successor of the immortal Clay, and well may Kentucky be proud of him. (Applause.) I will not withhold, either, the meed of praise due the Republican party in Congress for the course which they pursued. In the language of the IVth. Y. Tribune they came to the Douglas platform, abandoning their own, ('cheers,) believing that under the peculiar circumstances they would in that mode best subserve the interests of the country. (Good, good, and applause.) My friends, when I am battling for a great principle I want aid and support from whatever quarter I can get it in order to carry out that principle. (" That's right.") I never hesitate in my course when I find those who on all former occasions differed from me upon the principle finally coming to its support. Nor is it for me to inquire into the motives which animated the Republican members of Congress in supporting the Crittenden-Montgomery Bill. It is enough for me that in that case they came square up and endorsed the great principle of the Kansas, Nebraska Bill, which declared that Kansas should be received into the Union, with slavery or without, as its constitution should prescribe. (Cheers.) I was the more rejoiced at the action of the Republicans on that occasion for another reason. I could not forget,, you will not soon forget, how unanimous that party was in 1854 in declaring that never should another slave State be admitted into this Union under any circumstances whatever, and yet we find that during this last winter they came up and voted to a man declaring that Kansas should come in as a State with slavery under the Lecompton Constitution, if her people desired it, and that if they did not that they might form a new constitution with slavery or without, just as they pleased. I do not question the motive when men do a good act; I give them credit for the act ; and if they will stand by that principle in the future, and abandon their heresy of " no more slave States even if the people want them," I will then give them still more credit. I am afraid though that they will not stand by it in the future, (Laughter.) If they do, I will freely forgive them all the abuse they heaped upon me in 1854, for having advocated and carried out that same principle in the Kansas

Nebraska bill. Illinois stands proudly forward as a State which early took her position in favor of the principle of popular sovereignty as applied to the Territories of the United States, When the compromise measure of 1850 passed, predicated upon that principle, you recollect the excitement which prevailed throughout the northern portion of this State. I vindicated those measures then, and defended myself for having voted for them, upon the ground that they embodied the principle that every people ought to have the privilege of forming and regulating

if

ulating their own institutions to suit themselves that each State had that right, and I saw no reason why it should not be extended to the Territories. When the people of Illinois had an opportunity of passing judgment upon those measures they endorsed them by a vote of their representatives in the Legislature sixty-one in the affirmative and only four in the negative in which they asserted that the principle embodied in the measures was the birth-right of freemen, the gift of Heaven, a principle vindicated by our revolutionary fathers, and that no limitation should ever be placed upon it, either in the organization of a Territorial government or the admission of a State into the Union. That resolution still stands unrepealed on the journals of the Legislature of Illinois. In obedience to it, and in exact conformity with the principle, I brought in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, requiring that the people should be left perfectly free in the formation of their institutions, and in the organization of their government. I now submit to you whether I have not in good faith redeemed that pledge that the people of Kansas should be left perfectly free to form and regulate their institutions to suit themselves. ("You have," and cheers.) And yet, while no man can arise in any crowd and deny that I have been faithful to my principles, and redeemed my pledge, we find those who are struggling to crush and defeat me, for the very reason that I have been faithful in carrying out those measures. ("They can't do it," and great cheers.) We find the Republican leaders forming an alliance with professed Lecompton men to defeat every Democratic nominee and elect Republicans in their places, and aiding and defending them in order to help them break down Anti-Lecompton men, whom they acknowledge did right in their opposition to Lecompton. ("They can't do it.") The only hope that Mr. Lincoln has of defeating me for the Senate rests in the fact, that I was faithful to my principles, and that he may be able in consequence of that fact to form a coalition with Lecompton men, who wish to defeat me for that fidelity. ("They will never do it." "Never in the State of Illinois," and cheers.) This is one element of strength upon which he relies to accomplish his object. He hopes he can secure the few men claiming to be friends of the Lecompton Constitution, and for that reason you will find he does not say a word against the Lecompton Constitution or its supporters. He is as silent as the grave upon that subject. Behold Mr. Lincoln courting Lecompton votes, in order that he may go to the Senate as the Representative

of Republican principles ! {Laughter.} You know that the alliance exists. I think you will find that it will ooze out before the contest is over. (" That's my opinion," and cheers.) Every Republican paper takes ground with my Lecompton enemies, encouraging them, stimulating thorn in their (^position ,to me and styling my friends bOftrBfroinththeDeino{)ratic|)aPtydnd'their Lecompton allies the tta^ Democratife' party of the coilntryv ' If they think that they can mislead and de^ ceive the'tybble of Illinois Or the Bemocraey of Illinois; by that sort of an uti natural aM unholy alliance, I thik they ghOw Very littteisagiacity, or give'the: people very little credit for intelligence; =("Tha/ t'Si60j"&nd<;heers4) 5 ;It must be a conCfesti'of principle.' Either the'TfedicAl abolittoh principles of Mr. 'Lincolff ' must be maintained, or' the strong, constitutional, national Dettiocratic:princi- ' pies withffWWcfh iSift identifieam'ust be'carried'nti"- " !'-'; ' ^ ^- ri-u-c ;i i, ;: There cian lie btittwO'great political pairties im this ctjuntry;- 'T^he eiototefiti this yeari&nd ila ISS^im'tist nebeSsarily be between th&DJemoeracy tind' the R-" publicans;if We e(anjudge ffOtti present 1 indications. My *hole lifehae be6a identified"Witb=th(i'Democratic'party," (Cheefs.^"T ^have devoted' all of'my energies tO'aitOcating its principles and^ sustaining"its io^ganization." In>this" State the party Was neYerbetter uited'Of msore hstrBioniotis than at this time. {Cheers.}- TW' State conven! tioo"Which assembled On'th'e'2d Of'April andnOBtt-' inated FoSiiEY an6' FeBnc'ij 'Was regularly called by the'State Central Cotnmitteei' appointed'by'the previons State contention fdJ that'purpose.' The meetings' in each cWfity in'the State for the'appointment oi'delegates^tOihe'Convention' were regttlarly calledby'the county coaimittees,and the prObeedings'iu every; county in the State, as well as in the State convention were f'egulai^ in all re- - spects. No^dHvention vcas evermore ha'rmonio'as iti'its'ahti'On, or showed a' more tolerant and just spirit towards brother Democfi^tsi" The "leaders of the" party there assembled declared their inalterable attachment'tO the time hon-' ored priueipleS arid oi'ganization of"theDeffiocratic party, and to the Cincin- nati platform. They declared that that platform was the only authoritative ex-"" position Of DeniOci*atic principles; and that it mflst'so^stand nDtiliehanged by another national convention; that in the'-meantime they would make no new" tests, and submit to none; that they Would'prOsCribenO Democrat or permit" the proscription'Of Democrats'because of their OpiMioK'upon Lecotaptonism, Or >'; upon any! Othef issue which has arisen; hut would' recognize all men as Demo-" crats who reniairied inside Of the'Organization/preserved'the usages'of'the'par-' ty, and supported its nominees', f Great appJauSe.)" These bolting'Demo crats- who now clai'fe to be the peculiar friends of the National Administration, and have formed an' alliance With 'Mr. Lincoln and the Republicans for the pur- ' pose of defeating: the Demc^atic party, have ceased-to'claim fellowship with"" the Democratic organisation; have entirely separated themselves from it, and'- are endeavoring to'build up a faction in the'State, not with the'hope or expec- tation of electing any one-man who professes to "bea "Democrat to office in any county in'the State;'but merely tO'secure' the defeat of the' Democratic nomi- nees and the elert.ion of Republicans in'their places. What excuse can any honest Democrat have for 'abandoning t-he'Demotiratie Organization and joining with the Republicans,

("none") to defeat our nominees in view of the platform established by the State convention? They cannot pretend that they were proscribed because of their opinions upon Leconte's or any other question/ for the convention expressly declared that they recognized all as good Democrats who remained inside of the organization, and abided by the nomination. If the question is settled of is to be considered a stonewalling of "by the vote on the 3d of August, 'What possible excuse can a man give for keeping up a division for the purpose of profiting, his party, alter that election is over and the controversy has terminated? If we see that all who shall keep up this warfare for the purpose of dividing and destroying the party have made up their minds to abandon the Democratic Union for ever, and to join those for whose benefit they are now" trying to distract our party, and effect a change in the place of the Democratic nominee " " / / / ' V. - # r %

He responds

, I submit to you with confidence () - / / ^ Tu ' - ~ ^ _ , ^ . ^ . , ^ , , rung ii) the course I have pursued in Congress. ("Kigili; right!" in one unanimous shout.) I / And 1 submit, also; Vethel- I have not retreated in good faith ('very pledge 1 have made. it is '0n? ^ ("You have.") ^ Then my friends, the (Question recedes whether I shall be sustained or rejected? ("Sustained." 5 - 'If you are of the opinion that: 'Mt. Lincoln will sacrifice the interests' of Illinois better than I can; that he will maintain his honor and his dignity higher than it has been in my power to do; that your interests, and the interests of your children require his election instead of mine, it is your duty to give him your support. ("We don't think so.") If, on the contrary, you think that my adherence to these great fundamental principles upon which our government is founded is the true mode of sustaining the peace and harmony of the country, and maintaining the perpetuity of the republic, I then ask you to stand by me in the efforts I have made to that end. ("We will do it 1" "We will stand by you!") And this brings me to the consideration of the two points at issue between Mr. Lincoln and myself. The Republican convention when it assembled at Springfield, did me and the country the honor of indicating the man who was to be their standard bearer, and the embodiment of their principles in this State. I owe them my gratitude for thus making up a direct issue between Mr. Lincoln and myself. I shall have no controversies of a personal character with Mr. Lincoln. I have known him well for a quarter of a century. I have known him, as you all know him, a kind-hearted, amiable gentleman, a right good fellow, a worthy citizen, of eminent ability as a lawyer, and I have no doubt, sufficient ability to make a good Senator. The question, then, for you to decide is whether his principles are more in accordance with the genius of our free institutions, the peace and harmony of the republic than those which I advocate. ("No!" "no!" "Stephen A. Douglas, forever!") He tells you, in his speech made at Springfield, before the Convention which gave him his unanimous nomination, that: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." "I believe this Government cannot endure

permanently, half slave and half free." I "I do not expect the Union to be dissolved 1 don't expect the house to iall but I do expect it will cease to be divided." ' It will become all one thing, or all the other." i That is the fundamental principle upon which he sots out ia this campaign. (" We don't believe one word of it, no, never."j Well, I do not suppose yon will believe one word of it when you come to examine it carefully, and see its consequences. Although the Republic has existed from 1789 to this day, divided into free States and slave States, yet we are told that in the future it cannot endure iinle.ss they shall become all free or all slave f'all free.") For that reason he says, as the gentleman in the crowd says, that they must be all free (" no, no.") He wishes to go to the Senate of the United States in order i to carry out that line of public policy which will compel all the States in the south to become free. How is he going to do it ? (Laughter.) Has Con- gress any power over the subject of slavery in Kentucky, or Virginia, or any ether State of this Union 1 How, then, is Mr. Lincoln going to carry out that principle which he says is essential to the existence of this Union, to wit: that slavery must be abolished in all the States of the Union, or must be established in them all. You convince the South that they must either estab- lish slavery in Illinois, and in every other free State, or submit to its abolition in every Southern State, and yon invite them to make a warfare upon the Northern States in order to establish slavery, for the sake of perjwtuating it at home. Thus, Mr. Lincoln invites, by his proposition, a war of sections, a war between Illinois and Kentucky, a war between the free States and the slave States, a war between the North and the South, for the purpose of either exterminating slavery in every Southern State, or planting it in every North- ern State. He tells you that the safety of this Republic, that the existence of this Union depends upon that warfare being cairied on until one section or . the other shall be entirely subdued. The States must all be free or slave, for a house divided against itself cannot stand. That is Mr. Lincoln's argument upon that question. My friends, is it possiMe to preserve peace between the North and the South if such a doctrine shall prevail in either section of the Union ? Will you ever submit to a warfare waged by the Southern States to establish slavery in Illinois ? (" No.") What man in Illinois would not lose the last drop of his heart's blood before he would submit to the institution of ' slavery being forced upon us by the other States, against our will ? And if that be true of us, what Southern man would not shed the last drop of his heart's blood to prevent Illinois, or any other Northern State, interfering to abolish slavery in his State ? Each of these States is sovereign under the Qonstitution ; and if we wish to preserve our liberties, the reserved rights and sovereignty of each and every State must be maintained. I have said oh a former occasion, and I here repeat, that it is neither desirable nor possible to establish uniformity in the local and domestic institutions of all the States of this confederacy. And why ? Because the Constitution of the United States rests upon the right of every State to decide all its local and domestic institos- tions for itself. It is not possible, therefore, to make them conform to eack other unless we subvert the Constitution of the United States. (" That can't be done.") No sir, that cannot be done. God forbid, that any man should ever make the attempt. Let that Constitution ever be trodden under foot and de- stroyed, and there will not be wisdom and

patriotism enough left to make another that will work half so well. ("No, never," and cheers.) Our safety, our liberty depends upon preserving the Constitution of the United States as our fathers made it, inviolate, at the same time maintaining the reserved right and the sovereignty of each State over its local and domestic institutions; against federal authority, or any outside interference. The difference between Mr. Lincoln and myself upon this point is, that he goes for a combination of the Northern States, or the organization of a sectional political party in the free States to make war on the domestic institutions of the Southern States, and to prosecute that war until they shall all be subdued, and made to conform to such rules as the north shall dictate to them. ("It can't be done.") I am aware that Mr. Lincoln on Saturday night last, made a speech at Chicago, for the purpose, as he said, of explaining his position on this question, I have read that speech with great care, and I will do him the justice to say that it is marked by eminent ability and great success in concealing what he did mean to say in his Springfield speech. ("That's so," laughter and applause.)

>i^ 'X' u p' i

11 ! I fiiMimmM^^^

b.eeu arguing is, that he never did mean., lie never intended !to cobvey the idea tliat he) \) , / t> \i
-i / <i ..4 < X His answer to tMs poin- and that I ought to kiio wished the " people of the free States
to enter intPthe Southern States, an<J interfere with slavery." Well, I never did suppose that he
ever dreamed of enterintr irto Kentucky, to make war upon her institutions ,i| 4aBgri*to(^nor will
any Abolitionist ever enter into Kentucky to wage such war. (TinTjbtiiH li „MMMI^ Their mode of
making war is not to enter into those States where slavery exists, and there interfere, and render
themselves responsible for the coi- sequences Oh no ! They stand on this side of the Ohio river and
shoot across. ^JiitMy{li<iwpMiwWmiwKailfaiy{a^^ They stand in Blooming- ton, and shake their
lists at the people of Lexington; they threaten South Caro- lina from Chicago.4JiHMMMaafblMf^
And they call that bravery {-(^SBJmtir "f r"~rjfijmilBii'- if""iiiwri#^~g*", ' But they are very particular,
as Mr, Lincoln says, not to enter into those States for the purpose of interfering with the institution
of sbi- ery there. ,j^0 | |IWMMpi'I am not only opposed to entering into the Slave States, or the
purpose of interfering with their institutions, but I am opposed to a sectional agitation to control
the institutions of other States. i^i^iMIMMillitiii^ I ^ib opposed to organizing a sectional party, which
appeals to Northern pride, and M orthern passion and prejudice, against Southern institutions,
thus stirring up ill feeling and hot blood between brethern of the same Republic. T am op- posed
to that whole system of sectional agitation, which can pioduce nothing but strife, but discord,
but hostility and finally disunion. g^^^HjiMMW^ ^^'^ J*- Mr. Lincoln asks you to send him to the
Senate of the U. S., in order that he may carry out that great principle of his that all the States must
be slave or ali mast be free. I repeat, how is he to carry it out when he getsto-the Senate?. Does



he intend to introduce a bill to abolish slavery in Kentucky? Does he intend to introduce a bill to interfere with slavery in Virginia ? How is he t accomplish what he professes must be done in order to save the Union? Mr. Lincoln IS a lawyer, s'lga lous nod able en tijli to tell yon how he proposes to 'doit.

I ask Mr. Lincok how it is that he proposes ultimately to bring about this uniformity in each and all the States of the Union. Tliere is but one possible mode which I can se, and perhap Mr. Lincoln intends to pws i^ | that it'is to mtrodus^e a propositioB into the Senate to'change Ve^ Oon'stitution'of the Cfnitei'States, in'order fiat all the Stalje I^-egislalnres ma) int abolished,,State soyereignty blotted put, apd, the_power conteij-ed upon Congress to, ako, local laws,and establish the dom^,, tic institutions and ^police regulations umio , , ti ngbout the United States.--,' iidS'-Xbat.JROuW b'aB3rcby^*j<^fea<feeye^^^i^^ , A= ,you prepared forsuch,', a change in the institutions of your country r! -i^(f(Sb?'~*''^?-A(: ;'' "Its-mmm- i,tен_ Austria^) Whenever you shall ha,vе biot^ied out .the ..fetate &(Vereignties,' abolished the State Legislatures, aod consolidated, all tKepowpr in the Federal, government, you-will hava established a,consolid,ate4empirej as destructive to;', the liberties of the, people,and the rights of, the citizen, as, that of Austria, or. Russia, or any,other despotism tht rests upon the necks of the people. How is it possible for Mr. Lincoln to carry , put his chephshed pricipijle of abolishing slavery eyerywhere or establishing it everywhere, except byithe mode whicb I have pointedjp at by an amendment to, the Constitution to t^e effect I^at, I have, suggested ?. ', There is no other possible mode. , Mr. Lincoln intends resorting to that, or else |ie means,nothing ,by,the great principle upon wl^ichjie desires to be elected. My friends, I trust that we wiU, be able to get ^ui,to define what he do^ mean by, this Scriptural qiotp,faon that " Afhouse divided against itaelf cannot stand;" . that the government eaffnoteadi^re, permanently, half slave and half free; that it must be all one thing, pr all theoher.. \Who sjmongyou expects tp Jive or have his children live, until .slavery sha l, he established, in Il- linois or abolished in South,Carolina?, iy7,hOifxpec,tj to se;;);hat;pe(5ui;i,dii Qig, the lifetime of ourselves or our children?,,,f,,, : '!<,y,r ;') / '-1 ' , ' , '1 There is butone possible way inj^fvhicb.siavery can ,feaVlishe4 leaving a,:tate, according to the principle of the,Kansas-JSTebraska Billi perfectly free to form and regulate its institutions in jts ,own, way.; j^Mui^iAli^, That, was the principle,upon which this Republic was founded, and it is under the opera ,' tion of that principle that we, have beep able, to, preserve, the Union ^ thus far, Under its operations, slavery, disappeared fron^, New Hampshire, ,froij i.Rhode Island, fi;om Connecticut, from New York, fropi N,ew Jersey, from Penpsylvania, frpm six pf the twelve priigual slavebplding, States; anditlils gradual system ,of emancipa-fjion went,on quietly, peacefully an,d, steadily so long, as we in the, free States minded our own business, and left.oivr neighbors alone. ,,But th,e moment, the Abolition Societies were organized throughout ^he North,, preaching a violent crusade against slavery in the Sputhern Stfites, ,tljis corpbination uecessarilj caused a counter, combination in the South, ajid a sectioijal line was drawn which was a barrier to any further emancipation. Bear in mind that emancipation has not takeu,place in any ,one State since (.he Freespil partij was organized ^s a, political party in

this country, , Emancipatioji went^ pp gra,dually,in State (after State so long as the free Sfates were content v^jth managing their pwn affairs and leaving the South,perfectly free to do as they,pleased; b.ut.tlje.moipentthe North sai we are,powerful enough to cnptrl yop,of the puth, the moment the North proclaimed itself the determined masferof, the: i^outh, , that ,moaient the South combined to ,resist the attack, and thus sectional,parties were fprjmed ^nd , gradual emancipation ,cea8Qd in all the, l^orthcJU slaveholding States,,, ^*t>ifciw;i, Ji wWi^ Andryet,, Alr-, Linqoln, in view of tl;ese historical ffacts, proposes to keep up this sectional agitation, band all the Northern States together in o(ie,political part)', elect, 1^ President by Northern voteis, alone, and then,, ofcouse,, make a,. Cabinet composed of Northern men and administer the .government by Nprth-, em men ,only, denying all the Southern States of thirj, Uniop any participation in,, the Administration of aliairs whatsoever. I,submit to you, my fellow citizens,, vhethersijfth a line of policy is consistent with,, the, peace an^^ harmony of the country. Can the Union endure under such a systejtj of policy,? , He has tajcen hs position iu favpf.of sectional agitation apd seotipnal warfare. I have taken nine in favor of sequeing, peace, l^armouy !}nd gpod will ^mong all the States by , peraittipg each to mind its o\vn businesjtj and;diseountenancing, any attempt at inierference on the,part,of one State with the,.domestic coicieriis of the others. ^^ Mr., Lincoln makes afiother i-ssjie, with mp, an(jt.,he wishes,| to cnpfipe the cutest tpJthese two issues, I accept the other, as readily,, ,as the one to,which"" lave already referred The other issue is a oi'u.i:ade against the Supreme Court /6 4

. -"^\i.. :^^vf-- l

-Br

lim '. ^.--v

of the United States, because of its decision in the Dred Scott case. My fellow citizens, I have nofssue to make with the Supreme Court I have no ci'usade to preach against thai august body. I have no warfare to make upon it. 'l^ receive the decision of the Judges of that Court, when pronounced, as the final adjudication upon all questions wittiin their jurisdiction. It would be perfectly legitimate and proper for Mr. Lincoln, myself, or any other lawyer, to go before the ."^upreme Court and argue any question that might arise there, taking either side of it, and enforcing it with all our ability, zeal, and energy, but when the decision is pronounced, that decision becomes the law of the land, and he, and you, and my- self, and evo-y othej- good citizen, must bow to it, and yield obedience to it. 4fiagat3iy^wjeraTwiy<B8fli.jo.iltbit*.g nigiaA.") Unless we respect and bow in deference to the final decisions of the highest judicial tribunal in our country, we are driven at once to anarchy, to violence, to mob law, and there is no security left for our propert\, or our own civil rights. What protects your property but the law, and who expounds the law but the judicial tribunals; and if aa appeal is to be taken from the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United

States, in all cases where a person does not like the adjudication to whom is that appeal to be taken, Are we to appeal from the Supreme Court to a county meeting like this ? And shall we here reargue the question and reverse the decision ? If so, how are we to enforce our decrees after we have pronounced them? Does Mr. Lincoln intend to appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court to a Republican caucus, a general assembly or a town meeting? To whom is he going to appeal ? ("To, out,") say, "and shouts of laughter.") Why, if I understand aright, Lincoln and Lovejoy are co-appellants in a joint suit, and inasmuch as they are so, he would not certainly appeal from the Supreme Court to his own partner to decide the case for him. He would get a decision unless ; - if I do not object to it. Mr. Lincoln tells you that he is opposed to the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case. Well, suppose he is; what is he going to do about it ? ("Laughter.") I never got beat in a law suit in my life that I was not opposed to the decision, and if I had it before the Circuit Court I took it up to the Supreme Court, where, if I got beat again, I thought it better to say no more about it, as I did not know of any lawful mode of reversing the decision of the highest tribunal on earth, Now is Mr. Lincoln going to appeal? Why, he says he is going to appeal to Congress. Let us see how he will appeal to Congress. He tells us that on the 8th of March, 1820, Congress passed a law called the Missouri Compromise, prohibiting slavery forever in all the territory West of the Mississippi and North of the Missouri line of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes, that Dred Scott, a slave in Missouri, was taken by his master to Fort Snelling in the present State of Minnesota, situated on the West branch of the Mississippi river, and consequently in the territory where slavery was prohibited by the Act of 1820, and that when Dred Scott appealed for his freedom in consequence of having been taken into a free territory, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that Dred Scott did not become free by being taken into that Territory, but that having been carried back to Missouri, was yet a slave, Mr. Lincoln is going to appeal from that decision and reverse it He does not intend to reverse it as to Dred Scott. Oh, no! But he will reverse it so that it shall not stand as a rule in the future. How will he do it ? He says that if he is elected to the Senate he will introduce and pass a law just like the Missouri Compromise, prohibiting slavery again in all the Territories. Suppose he does re-enact the same law which the Court has pronounced unconstitutional, will that make it constitutional? If the Act of 1820 was unconstitutional in consequence of Congress having no power to pass it, will Mr. Lincoln, make it constitutional by passing it again? What clause of the Constitution of the United States provides for an appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court to Congress, If my reading of that instrument is correct, it is to the effect that that Constitution and all laws made in pursuance of it are of the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of a State to the contrary notwithstanding. Hence, you will find that only such acts of Congress are laws as are made in pursuance of the Constitution. When Congress has passed an act, and put it on the statute book as a law, who is to decide whether that act is in conformity with the Constitution or not ? The Constitution of the United States tells you. It has provided that the judicial power of the United States shall be

vested in a Supreme Court, and such inferior Courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. Thus by the Constitution the Supreme Court is declared, in so many words, to be the tribunal, and the only tribunal which is competent to adjudicate upon the constitutionality of an act of Congress. He tells you that that Court has adjudicated the question, and decided that an act of Congress prohibiting slavery in the Territory is unconstitutional and void; and yet he says he is going to pass another like it. What for? Will it be any more valid? Will he be able to convince the Court that the second act is valid when the first is invalid and void? What good does it do to pass a second act? Why, it will have the effect to arraign the Supreme Court before the people, and to bring them into all the political discussions of the country. Will that do any good? Will it inspire any more confidence in the judicial tribunals of the country? What good can it do to wage this war upon the Court, array it against Congress, and Congress against the Court. The Constitution of the United States has said that this government shall be divided into three separate and distinct branches, the executive, the legislative and the judicial, and of course each one is supreme and independent of the other within the circle of its own powers. The functions of Congress are to enact the Statutes the province of the Court is to pronounce upon their validity, and the duty of the Executive is to carry the decision into effect when rendered by the Court. And yet notwithstanding the Constitution makes the decision of the Court final in regard to the validity of an act of Congress, Mr. Lincoln is going to reverse that decision by passing another act of Congress. (imagine) When he has become convinced of the folly of the proposition perhaps he will resort to the same subterfuge that I have found others of his party resort to, which is, to agitate and agitate until he can change the Supreme Court and put other men in the places of the present incumbents. I wonder whether Mr. Lincoln is right sure that he can accomplish that reform. He certainly will not be able to get rid of the present Judges until they die, (June 14) and from present appearances I think they have as good security of life as he has himself. I am afraid that my friend, Lincoln, would not accomplish this task during his own lifetime, and yet he wants to go to Congress to do it all you think that he can persuade himself to do in six years. Do to die in that I. 'six years just to accommodate him? (february -lyfe-feawghtef.)

m \

...y appointed Judges for life, and according to the present organization, new ones cannot be appointed during that time; but he is going to agitate until they die, (imagine) and then have the President appoint good Republicans in their places. He had better be quite sure that he gets a Republican President at the same time to appoint them, (imagine) He wants to have a Republican President elected by Northern votes, not a Southern man participating, and elected for the purpose of placing none but Republicans on the bench, and consequently, if he succeeds in electing that President, and succeeds in persuading the present Judges to die, in order that their vacancies may be filled,

that the President will then appoint their successors. And by what process will he appoint them? He first looks for a man who has the legal qualifications, perhaps he takes Mr. Lincoln, and says, "Mr. Lincoln, would you not like to go on the Supreme bench?" "Yes," replies Mr. Lincoln. "Well," returns the Republican President, "I cannot appoint you until you give me a pledge as to how you will decide in the event of a particular question coming before you," What would you think of Mr. Lincoln if he would consent to give that pledge? And yet he is going to prosecute a war until he gets the present Judges out and then catechize each man and require a pledge before his appointment as to how he will decide each question that may arise upon points affecting the Republican party. Now, my friends, suppose this scheme was practical, I ask you what confidence you would have in a Court thus constituted a Court composed of partisan Judges, appointed on political grounds, selected with a view to the decision of questions in a particular way, and pledged in advance to a decision before the argument, and without reference to the peculiar state of the country. Would such a Court command the respect of the country? If the Republican party cannot trust Democratic Judges, how can they expect us to trust Republican Judges, when they have been selected in advance for the purpose of packing a decision in the event of a case arising. My fellow citizens, whenever partisan politics shall be carried on to the bench; whenever the Judges shall be arraigned upon the stump, and their judicial conduct reviewed in town meetings and caucuses; whenever the independence and integrity of the judiciary shall be tampered with to the extent of rendering them partial, blind, and suppliant tools, what security will you have for your rights and your liberties? I therefore take issue with Mr. Lincoln directly in regard to this warfare upon the Supreme Court of the United States. I accept the decision of that Court as it was pronounced. Whatever my individual opinions may be, I, as a good citizen, am bound by the laws of the land as the Legislature makes them, as the Court expounds them, and as the executive officers administer them. I am bound by our Constitution as our fathers made it, and as it is our duty to support it. I am bound, as a good citizen, to sustain the constituted authorities, and to resist, discourage, and beat down, by all lawful and peaceful means, all attempts at exciting mobs, or violence, or any other revolutionary proceedings against the Constitution and the constituted authorities of the country. / Mr. Lincoln is alarmed for fear that, under the Dred Scott decision, slavery will go into all the Territories of the United States. All I have to say is that, with or without that decision, slavery will go just where the people want it, and not one inch further. You have had experience upon that subject in the case of Kansas. You have been told by the Republican party that from 1854, when the Kansas-Nebraska bill passed, down to last winter, that slavery was sustained and supported in Kansas by the laws of what they called a "bogus" legislature. And how many slaves were there in the Territory at the end of last winter? Not as many at the end of that period as there were on the day the Kansas Nebraska bill passed. There was quite a number of slaves in Kansas, taken there under the Missouri Compromise, and in spite of it, before the Kansas Nebraska bill passed, and now it is asserted that there are not as many

there as there were before the passage of the bill, notwithstanding that they had local laws sustaining and encouraging it enacted, as the Republicans say, by a "bogus" Legislature, imposed upon Kansas, by an invasion from Missouri. Why has not slavery obtained a foothold in Kansas under these circumstances? Simply because there was a majority of her people opposed to slavery, and every slave holder knew that if he took his slaves there, the moment that majority got possession of the ballot boxes, and a fair election was held, that moment slavery would be abolished and he would lose them. For that reason, such owners as took their slaves there brought them back to Missouri, fearing that if they remained they would be emancipated. Thus you see that under the principle of popular sovereignty, slavery has been kept out of Kansas, notwithstanding the fact that for the first three years they had a Legislature in that Territory favorable to it. I tell you, my friends, it is impossible under our institutions to force slavery on an unwilling people. If this principle of popular sovereignty asserted in the Nebraska bill be fairly carried out, by letting the people decide the question for themselves, by a fair vote, at a fair election, and with honest returns, slavery will never exist one day, or one hour, in any Territory against the unfriendly legislation of an unfriendly people. I care not how the Dred Scott decision may have settled the abstract question so far as the practical result is concerned; for, to use the language of an eminent southern Senator, on this very question 'I do not care a fig which way the decision shall be, for it is of no particular consequence; slavery cannot exist a day, or an hour in any Territory or State, unless it has affirmative laws sustaining and supporting it, furnishing police regulations and remedies, and an omission to furnish them, would be as fatal as a constitutional prohibition. Without affirmative legislation in its favor, slavery could not exist any longer than a new born infant could survive under the heat of the sun, on a barren rock without protection. It would wilt and die for the want of support.' Hence, if the people of a Territory want slavery they will encourage it by passing affirmative laws, and the necessary police regulations, patrol laws and Slave code. If they withhold it, if they withhold that legislation, and if withholding it slavery is as dead as if it were prohibited by a Constitutional prohibition. Especially if in addition their legislation is unfriendly, it would be if they were opposed to it. They could pass such local laws and police regulations as would drive slavery but in a few days, or one week if they were opposed to it, and it would be so far as the question of slavery in the Territory is concerned, so far as the principle of popular sovereignty is concerned in to the practical operation of it, the Dred Scott case may be decided with reference to the former. my own Opinion on that law point is well known. It is shown by my Notes to his speeches in Congress: 'But be it as the question was an abstract question, inviting no practical result. Slavery shall exist or shall not exist in any State or Territory, will depend upon the will of the people.'

>..J."V- !> ^it?..:^^ 1



whether the i)eoplewife; for it W'agmnat it, alild whfch ever way they sba I decide It in aay Temtoia^ or (te'-iDy State, win be entirely sat5sfkctdry't6'ine! .(es.k^i , -u T. 4 a"?*.'''*-'. ''''*^'''' ^^^^ ''^^''''^^ dpbri Mr. EinooTn's' main objectirfn to the Dred Scott decision. He is'not going'to stibiriittb'it. ' Not that te is go- ing tomake war it^oii !t-with force of arms.' BtffHe is gottg to apriedl and re- verse It iii sotne mr, he'canrWt teir^iis'bovfl' I 'reckon tibt by a writ of error,' because I do not know where Ee would OTosecute that/feceptbdJofe'Sri iboHtion- society. (aiajaa&ai^aBt.ifl\$flau .) And 'when H&'appeals; be-^dOes'tiot'ex- actly tell Tis to whom he will appeal, except it be thfe RepubJicafa pirty; and I have yet to learn'that ilieRepuKlicaii pafty, linder the eoristitutibn, hasjildlclaj ' powers; but he is going'to a^ealfrcltn'it"ahd"rev-erseit either'by anaiit c^f Oon'- ' gress,or by turning o4it the' judges, dr'iti's'ome other Way. ' And 'wHyf B&s cause he'says that tijat dMsion deprives aetie^rri of'the' benfifs' of that clause' of the Constitutiibii of the'United States which entitles'tH'e'citizens'of'eaCh State to all the priviiegeS atad imrnunities of 'citizens of 'the 'several 'States; Well, it is very triie that the decision 'does have that^fTeCt. By deciding'fliafa negro is not a citizen, of Course Jt'denies to Him the'rights and privileges 'awarded to cit- izens of theUnited'States. 'It is'tihis that'Mr, Lincoln will'not submit to.-^' Why? 'For the palpable reason that he wishes to'confer ilpOri' the negro all the rights; privileges, and im'tnunities of citizens of the s6Vei-al Stated. 'I'll not quarrel ^ith -Mr. Ein'coln for his views 'on that subject. I have no doiibt he iS conscientibu's'i'n 'theiti'. I have iibt the'slightest idea but tliathe'consfcitotiously" believes that a negro ought to eijjby' 'and exercise all the rights'and -privileges"" given to'white tiieH, but T do notagree' with him, aiid' hence'I ca^ "hot coneir"" with hirii'. ' "I b'elieve tWat this gOverntiient of ours was fdtind on^the white basis'. ' (*!^Wl^U^n^?(l^)(ili(!! Mlfg:)" rbyieve'that it was 'establish^" by white men: ^lJpit; fiaii)"^bj? men'of 'Ertro}}ean birth or descended of Etir< pean races, for the' ' benefit o'f vrhitd men 'and' tlieir 'posterity in all tiriie t'o'corcio'. ' i^Jjs^S^^0i^^ " I do not believe that it ivas the d'esigh or in'ten'tiofi bf t'He signer^ of tji'e dieclara- tion of lffdeperidetee ob- the' fra:mers'of'the'(.onstitutibff to'intiluctfe negroes, Ind'i^ans or ottfei-inferior riices With white'ttien as citizeii^'. ' ^^MtlliBi) ' O'tir ' lahei^" had at thli't'day s'eeii"the"evif cbristiqiienbes'oi conferring'civil a'lVd' pblitical rights ' upon the'Indifin dnd Negro in th'e-Spanish and French col'b'nife oil' the AmetF' can contiieMt and' the adjacent islafids. 111 Mexico, in Central America,'iti South- America aiid in the West India islands, whbrt the Indian, the 'Negnj, a^id meti' of all colors and all races are put 'on an equality by""laV, the effect Of political' amalgamation can be seen. Ask'iny'of tH'ose'gallantyoung men in yo'ur o-wh' county, w'ho went to Mexicb'to fight the battles of their'country, in -(vhat friend' Lincoln considersan'unjust and'unholy' n'-ar, arid 'b^ar w^at they will ttjll you ill' r^ard tothe aiiialgamati'o'n of rac'cs in' that country. ' Amalgamation there, first political', then social, has led'to'dernoralization and'd'egradatigm,'until'l'fh- ag' reduced that j^eoble below the point Of e'apacity for 'self governrfieutJ' Oiiir fathers knew what the effect of it Would'be, atid frbiji the time they plaited foot Oil the' American'continent, nbt o'fily "those wlib landed at Jamesto-tvh, but at Plyihouth'-' Rock and-all other ppirifs dii'the ibkst,

tKe}>'pilkie'd'the policy'of con-fining civil'- and politicar'tightS' tB'tb.e'White race,"kfTd" fixcluWih'g thfe-'rieg'tb Iri all" casies.-i-- Stili Mr " " - - -- citizi He qu' Lincoln conscientiously believes that it is his duty to advocate negro": ' H'6'*"w'aiits ' to 'giv6"tBe""n^| | ^^ the privilege Sf'citzerisiip. i---' Sc'ripfuri-"agari""aWd""says^!""""Asy^nr'-father iri"Heai?eti is' pHTfb^ 'be ye also perfect," and he applies that Scriptural quotation to all classes, not that he expects us all to be as perfect as our master, but as nearly perfect as possible. In other words, he is willing to give the negro an equality under the law, in order that he may approach as near perfection or an equality with the white roan as possible. To this same end he quotes the Declaration of Independence in these words: "We hold these truths to be self evident, that aH men were created equal, and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and goes on to argue that the negro was included, or intended to ba included in that declara- tion by the signers of the paper. He says that by the Declaration of Inde- pendence, therefore, all kinds of men, negroes included, were created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and further, that the right of the negro to be on an equality with the white man is a divine right conferred by the Almighty, and rendered inalienable according to the Declaration of Independence. Hence no human law or constitution can deprive the negro of that equality with the white man to which he is entitled by divine law. (" Higher law.") Yes, higher law. Now, I do not question Mr. Lincoln's sincerity on this point. He believes that the negro, by the Divine law, is cre- ated the equal of the white man, and that no human law can deprive him of that equality; thus secured; and he contends that the negro ought therefore to have all the rights and privileges of citizenship on an equality with the white man. In order to accomplish this the first thingthat would have to be done in this State would be to blot out of our State Constitution that clause which prohibits negroes from coming into this State, and making it an African colony, and per- mit them to come and spread over these charming prairies until in midday they shall look black as nigiiit. When our friend Lincoln gets all his colored brethern around him here, he will then raise them to perfection as fast as possible, and place them on an equality with the white man, first removing all legal restrictions, because they are our equals by Divine law, and there should be no such restric- tions. He wants them to vote, I am opposed to it If they had a vote I reckon they would all vote for him in preference to me, entertaining the views I do. (Lin^liLu.) But that matters not. The position he has taken on this question not only presents him as claiming for them the right to vote, but their right under the Divine law and the Declaration of Independence, to be elected to office, to become members of the Legislature, to go to Congress, to become Governors, or United States Senators, ^awgittewnaaA^ohaMS,) or Judges of the Supreme Court ; and I suppose that when they control that Court they will probably reverse the Dred Scott Decision. ""(Jfe^wtgi^BP.) He is going to bring negroes here, and give ther a the right of citizenship, the right of voting, and the ' right of holding office and sitting on juries, and what else.^ Why, he would permit them to marry, would ho not? And if ho gives them that right, I sup- pose he will let them marry whom they please, provided they marry their equals, (famgititi'i) If the Divine law declares

that the white man is the equal of the negro woman that they are on a perfect equality, I suppose he admits the right of the negro woman to marry the white man. ^uut ti ed"iawghtiwi.-) In other words, his doctrine that the negro, by Divine law, is placed on a perfect equality with the white man, and thai that equality is recognized by the Decla- tion of Independence, leads him necessarily to establish negro equality under the law; but whether even then they would be so in fact would depend upon li W^

ll^p^

the degree of viitue and ii.telligfcnce they possessed, and certain other qualitis that are matters of taste rather than of law. ^.ka^litw) I do not uiiderBtand Mr. Lincoln as saying that he expects to make them our equals socially, or by intelligence, nor in fact as citizens, but that he wishes to make them oiir equals under the law, and then say to them, "as yourmasterin Heaven ifl perfect be ye also perfect."/SWell, I confess to you my fellow citizens, that I am utterly opposed to that system of abol tion philosophy "i^^-um'-ij^VSA ^iiaww) 1 do not believe th.'it the signers of the Declaration of Independei;.-* had any reference to negroes when they used the expression that all men were created equal, or that they had any reference to the Chinese or Coolies, the Indians the Japanese, or any other inferior race. They were speaking of the white race, the European race on this ooUiuent, and their decendants, and emigrants who should eome here. They were speaking only of the white race, and never dreamed that their language would be construed to include the negro. f8tw!W) And now for the evidence of that faot. At the time the Declaration of Independence was put forth, declaring the equality of all men, every one of the thirteen colonies was a slaveholding colony, and every man who signed that Declaration represented a slaveholding constituency. Did they intend, when they put their signatures to that instrument, to declare that their own slaves were on an equality with them; that they were made their equals by divine law, and that any human law reducing them to an inferior position, was void, as being in violation of divine law ? Was that the meaning of the signers of the Declaration of Independence ? Did Jefpberson and Hbnrv, and Lbb did any of the signers of that instrument, or all of them, on the day they signed it give their slaves freedom ? History records that they did not. Did they go further, and pat the negro on an equality with the white man throughout che country ? They did not. And yet if they had understood that Declaration as including the negro, which Mr. Lincoln holds they did, they would have been bound, as conscientious men, to have restored the negro to that equality which he thinks the Almighty intended they should occupy with the white man. They did not do it. Slavery was abolished in only one State before the adoptioB of the Constitution in l'i89, and then in others gradu- ally, down to the time this abolition agitation began, and it has not been abol- ished in one since. The history of the country shows that neither the signers of the Declaration, or the framers of the Constitution ever supposed it possible that their language would be used in an attempt to make

this nation a mixed nation of Indians, negroes, whites and mongrels. I repeat, that our whole history confirms the proposition that from the earliest settlement of the colonies down to the Declaration of Independence and the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, our fathers proceeded on the white basis, making the white people the governing race, but conceding to the Indian and negro, and all inferior races, all the rights and all the privileges they could enjoy consistent with the safety of the society in which they lived. ("ImlCbatigiwgh'fc") That is my opinion now. >4fcJfcaH*igtti'*), I told you that humanity, philanthropy, justice and sound policy required that we should give the negro every right, every privilege, every immunity consistent with the safety and welfare of the State. The question then naturally arises what are those rights and privileges, and what is the nature and extent of them. My answer is that that is a question which each State and each Territory must decide for itself. We have decided that question. We have said that in this State the negro shall not be a slave, but that he shall enjoy no political rights- that negro equality shall not exist. I am content with that position. ("^lyRfij^rtia) My friend Lincoln is not. He thinks that our policy and our laws on that subject are contrary to the Declaration of Independence. He thinks that the Almighty made the negro his equal and his brother. |^|>aug.htm' AAise. j For my part I do not consider the negro any kin to me, (^teat7?^ applsHsav) ! or to any other white man ; but I would still carry my humanity and my philanthropy to the extent of giving him every privilege and every immunity that he could enjoy, consistent with our own good. We in Illinois have the right to decide upon that question for ourselves, and we are bound to allow every other State to do the same. Maine allows the negro to vote on an equality with the white man. I do not quarrel with our friends in Maine for that. If they think it wise and proper in Maine to put the negro on an equality with the white man, and allow him to go to the polls and exercise the vote of a white man, it is their business and not mine. On the other hand, New York permits a negro to vote provided he owns \$250 worth of property. New York thinks that a negro ought to be permitted to vote, provided he is rich, but not otherwise. They allow the aristocratic negro to vote there, .ffam^ttasv) I never saw the wisdom, the propriety or the justice of that decision on the part of New York, and yet it never occurred to me that I had a right to find fault with that State. It is her business; she is a sovereign State, and has a right to do as she pleases, and if she will take care of her own negroes, making such regulations concerning them as suit her, and let us alone: I will mind my business, and not interfere with her. In Kentucky they will not give a negro any political or any civil rights. I shall not argue the question whether Kentucky in so doing has decided right or wrong, wisely or unwisely. It is a question for Kentucky to decide for herself. I believe that the Kentuckians have consciences as well as ourselves; they have as keen a perception of their religious, moral and social duties as we have, and I am willing that they shall decide this slavery question for themselves, and be accountable to their God for their action. It is not for me to arraign them for what they do. I will not judge them lest I shall be judged. Let Kentucky mind her own business, and take care of her negroes, and we attend to our own affairs, and take care of our negroes, and we will be the best of friends; but if Kentucky attempts to interfere with us, or we with

her, there will be strife, there will be discord, there will be relentless hatred, there will be everything but fraternal feeling and brotherly love. It is not necessary that you should enter Kentucky and interfere in that State, to use the language of Mr. Lincoln. It is just as offensive to interfere from this State, or send your missies over there. I care not whether an enemy, if he is going to assault us, shall actually come into our State, or come along the line, and throw his bomb-shells over to explode in our midst. Suppose England should plant a battery on the Canadian side of the Niagara river, opposite Buffalo, and throw bomb-shells over, which would explode in Main street, in that city, and destroy the buildings, and that, when we protested, she would say, in the language of Mr. Lincoln, that she never dreamed of coming into the United States to interfere with us, and that she was just throwing her bombs over the line from her own side, which she had a right to do, would that

explanation satisfy So it is with Mr. Lincoln,

"s^ ^ !?r*/^ . - -H. -TK, - n i

my Ho is not going into Kentucky, but he will plant his batteries on this side of the Ohio, where he is safe and secure for a retreat, and will throw his bomb shells his abolition documents over the river, and will carry on a political warfare, and get up strife between the North and the South until he elects a sectional President, reduces the South to the condition of dependent colonies, raises the negro to an equality, and forces the South to submit to the doctrine that a house divided against itself cannot stand that the Union divided into half slave States and half free cannot endure that they must all be slave or they must all be free, and that as we in the North are in the majority, we will not permit them to be all slave, and therefore they in the South must consent to the States all being free. ('LU{,htM'). Now, fellow-citizens, I submit to you whether these doctrines are consistent with the peace and harmony of this Union. (fe4iap3!) I submit to you whether they are consistent with our duties as citizens of a common confederacy; whether they are consistent with the principles which ought to govern brethren of the same family? I recognize all the people of these States, North and South, East and West, old or new, Atlantic or Pacific, as our brethren, flesh of one flesh, and I will do no act unto them that I would not be willing they should do unto us. I would apply the same Christian rule to the States of this Union that we are taught to apply to individuals, "do unto others as you would have others do unto you," and this would secure peace. Why should this slavery agitation be kept up? Does it benefit the white man or the slave? Who does it benefit except the Republican politicians, who use it as their hobby to ride into office. j^Hmmm) Why, I repeat, should it be continued? Why cannot we be content to administer this government as it was made a confederacy of sovereign and independent States? Let us recognize the sovereignty and independence of each State, refrain from interfering with the domestic institutions and regulations of other States, permit the Territories and new States to decide their institutions for

themselves, as we did wheti we were m their con- dition ; blot out these lines of North and South, and resort back to these lines of State boundaries which the Constitution has marked out, and engraved upon the face of the country; have no other dividing lines but these, and we will be one united, harmonious, people, with fraternal feelings, and no discord or dissension ""These arr my views and these are the principles to which I have devoted all my energies since 1850, when I acted side by side with the immortal Clay and the God-like Webster in that memorable straggle m which Whigs and Dem- ocrats united upon a common platform of patriotism and the Constitution, throw- ing aside pariizan feelings in order to restore i>ea.ce and harmony to a distracted COTCilry. ABd when I stood (-eside the death bed of iMr. Clay, and heard him refer with feelings and emotions of the deepest solicitude to the welfare of the d<iuiitry;'and saw that he' looked' tipon the priricpte embodied in 'tfie' grfeat Com- "tiromise m&surfes bf 1850, the principle of the Nebi-aska^bdl, the doctrine of ieav- iig'each St^e'ahd Territory frefe to decide its' institutibiis for itself,'as the only mtahs tty which the peace of the cciuntry could' be preserved ahd; ;the Union per- "pelliaafed; I pledged him, on that death bed of his, thit so lotig as I'lived my enereies shdnl'd be devdtd to the vindication of th'slf principle, arid' of hiS fame as 'connected'with'ifc ^U-HMs#!iaie^a*aS^ffew^^ 'I gave the same pledge to the greit eXptfutid^r of the Constitution, he" who 'hiis; been' called the "" God-like Webster." * llobkedup'to Clay arid iith as a'stfn would (0 a lather, 'stndl'M upon tlie people of Illinois, sihd the people of the'Mdle Union to bear 'tfestiyibny'ffllit'nevl'"since the sod'has beeti laid lipotithfe'^ravfes^bf these em- inent statfenifen have I failed oil any occBsioito vindicate the'jinnciple with 'which the last,'great,'cr6wning acts of their' lives were ldfenMed,- or to vindi- '^Caty'thcjii- namfes Whenever they have been assaifed';, arid libW'my life and ener- 'iy a're devoted to this great work 'ds th6 means of preserving this Umon.--- 'loifta^^ tids tJnion'can only be preserved' by hi'anitaiuitig the fraternal 'SS'betwbdiithe' <forth and the South, the East" and the West. If that ^obdleeing'cto B6 preSeVve'd, the Union will be as perpetual as thd fame ot its lreat'^ founders. It can'be'maintained by preserving the_ Sovereignty of the M'tes, the right of each State and each Tertitory to settleits domestic concerns ; ""for itself, and theMty bf each to refrain'from intferferlhg with the^other in any of its local or domestic'instittitiioite'.' Let that be done and the Union will be ' Perpetual; let that be done', and this Republic, which began'with thirteen States "Md Which no'wfahuibers'tbirty-t'wo; which v?hen it begarl only extended trom 'tii'e Atlantic to the Missisdi'ppi, but now reaches to th'e Pacifi'o, may yet expand ^ANbrth and South, until it covers the whole Continent, and becomes one vast '(jtean-feund'bonfedbraiy. I^fiMafretowBg-.)^ Then, my friends, the, path ot ' daW oflibnoi^, of Patriotism'is'plain.' -Ther<i'are a feW'simple principles to be 'preserved. "Be'ifin- mind'the dividing li'tie between StWe rights iind federal * ' a4lthority:"fet ili maintain the gr'ekt principles of pbpula'r'soTereignty,^of State "ri^htsl'ank of thy'Federal'triibn;^s the Ux>iistttutibh U^ thisre- 'piblic will eildure fbreybr. """"^"" '='; ' .. " ;; . """,/;; """"<','il'iu-^j ^ ' ' ' ' I tBank 'yott kih'dly for tlie' ^^tlence witH Wttcfa' yiiti 'have'fet^ned to me "1 fear I have wearied'yo'ti. ^^0, ,6;* ""? i'). I have a'lieayy day's v^bffi'before'me'td'morrow;- 'I'have several speeches to'make.

- My friends, in this hard I am, 'tis a tax on my endurance, but I shall take the
 reception they have given me, and the kindness with which they have listened to me, I remember
 that when I first came among you here twenty-five years ago, I was pros-
 trated in this district, and that my efforts were rewarded, when my deficiencies were too apparent, I
 am afraid, too concealed from my eyes. I rendered the courtesy and kindness with which I was
 uniformly treated by you all, and whenever I can recognize the face of one of your old citizens it is
 like meeting an old and cherished friend; I come among you with a heart filled with gratitude for past
 favors. I have been with you but little for the past few years on account of my official duties, I intend
 to visit you again before the Campaign is over I wish to speak to your whole people. I wish them to
 pass judgment upon the correctness of the course, and the soundness of the principles which I
 have proclaimed. If you do not approve my principles I cannot ask your support, if you believe
 that the election of Mr. Lincoln would contribute more to preserve the harmony of the Union,
 and more to the prosperity and honor and the glory of the State, then it is your duty to give him the
 preference. If, on the contrary, you believe that I have been faithful to my trust, and that by sustaining
 me you will give greater strength and efficiency to the principles which I have expounded, I shall then be
 grateful for your support. I thank you for your attention. . . . " J. M. D. O.

!! It --S^ff^H&i,. ^SfSSJ"?

i X

^!~^ ^S^ v"-* ^ ^," ^S.. C" ^ ^ SPEECH OF SENATOR DOUGLAS. Mr. Edwards having introduced
 Senator Doug- las to the audience, -SINATOK POCQLAS Said; Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens of
 Springfield and old Sangamon My heart is filled with emo- tions at the allusions which have been
 so happily and so kindly made in the welcome just extended to me a welcome so numerous and
 so enthusi- astic, bringing me to my home among my old friends, that language cannot express my
 grati- tude. I do feel at home whenever I return to old Sangamon and receive those kind and friendly
 greetings which have never failed to meet me when I have come among you ; but never before
 have I had such occasion to be grateful and to be proud of the manner of the reception as on the
 present. While I am willing, sir, to attribute a part of this demonstration to those kind and friendly
 personal relations to which you have referred, I cannot conceal from myself that the controlling
 and pervading element in this great mass of human beings is devotion to that princi- ple of self-
 government to which so many years of ' my life have been devoted; and rejoice more in considering
 it an approval of my support of a cardinal principle than I would if I could appro- priate it to myself
 as a personal compliment. You but speak rightly when you assert that during the last session of
 congress there was an attempt to violate one of the fundamental princi- ples upon which our free

institutions rest. The attempt to force the Lecompton constitution upon the people of Kansas against their will, would have been, if successful, subversive of the great fundamental principles upon which all our institutions rest. If there is any one principle more sacred and more vital to the existence of a free government than all others, it is the right of the people to form and ratify the constitution under which they are to live. It is the corner stone of the temple of liberty, it is the foundation upon which the whole structure rests, and whenever it can be successfully evaded self-government has received a vital stab. I deemed it my duty, as a citizen and as a representative of the state of Illinois, to resist, with all my energies and with whatever of ability I could command, the consummation of that effort to force a constitution upon an unwilling people. I am aware that other questions have been connected, or attempted to be connected, with that great struggle, but they were mere collateral questions, not affecting the main point. My opposition to the Lecompton constitution rested solely upon the fact that it was not the act and deed of that people, and that it did not embody their will. I did not object to it upon the ground of the slavery clause contained in it. I should have resisted it with the same energy and determination even if it had been a free state instead of a slaveholding state ; and as an evidence of this fact I wish you to bear in mind that my speech against that Lecompton act was made on the 9th day of December, nearly two weeks before the vote was taken on the acceptance or rejection of the slavery clause. I did not then know, I could not have known, whether the slavery clause would be accepted or rejected, the general impression was that it would be rejected, and in my speech I assumed that impression to be true ; that probably it would be voted down ; and then I said to the U. S. senate, as I now proclaim to you, my constituents, that you have no more right to force a free state upon an unwilling people than you have to free a slave state upon them against their will. You have no right to force either a good or a bad thing upon a people who do not choose to receive it. And then, again, the highest privilege of our people is to determine for themselves what kind of institutions are good and what kind of institutions are bad, and it may be true that the same people, situated in a different latitude and different climate, and with different productions and different interests, might decide the same question one way in the north and another way in the south, in order to adapt their institutions to the wants and wishes of the people to be affected by them. You all are familiar with the Lecompton struggle, and I will occupy no more time upon the subject, except to remark that when we drove the enemies of the principle of popular sovereignty from the effort to force the Lecompton constitution upon the people of Kansas, and when we compelled them to abandon the attempt and to refer that constitution to that people for acceptance or rejection, we obtained a concession of the principle for which I had contended throughout the struggle. When I saw that the principle was conceded, and that the constitution was not to be forced on Kansas against the wishes of the people, I felt anxious to give the proposition my support ; but, when I examined it, I found that the mode of reference to the people and the form of submission, upon which the vote was taken, was so objectionable as to make it unfair and unjust. . Sir, it is an axiom with me that in every free government an unfair

election is no election at all Every election should be free, should be fair, with the same privileges and the same inducements for a negative as for an affirmative vote. The objection to what is called the "English" proposition, by which the Lecompton constitution was referred back to the people of Kansas was this, that if the people chose to accept the Lecompton constitution they could come in with only 35,000 inhabitants, while if they determined to reject it in order to form another more in accordance with their wishes and sentiments, they were compelled to wait until they should have 93,420 inhabitants. In other words, it was making a distinction and discrimination between free states and slave states under the federal constitution. I deny the justice, I deny the right, of any distinction or discrimination between the states north, and south, free or slave. Equality among the states is a fundamental principle of this government. Hence while I will never consent to the passage of a law that a slave state may come in with 35,000 while a free state shall not come in unless it have 93,000, on the other hand I shall not consent to admit a free state with a population of 35,000, and require 98,000 in a slaveholding state. My principle is to recognize each state of the Union as independent, sovereign and equal in its sovereignty. I will apply that principle not only to the original thirteen states, but to the states which have since been brought into the Union, and also to every state that shall hereafter be received, "as long as water shall run and grass grow." For these reasons I felt compelled by a sense of duty, by a conviction of principle, to record by vote against what is called the English bill; but yet the bill became a law, and under that law an election has been ordered to be held on the first Monday in August for the purpose of determining the question of the acceptance or rejection of the proposition submitted by congress. I have no hesitation in saying to you, as the chairman of your committee has justly said in his address, that whatever the decision of the people of Kansas may be at that election, it must be final and conclusive of the whole subject; for if at that election a majority of the people of Kansas shall vote for the acceptance of the congressional proposition, Kansas from that moment becomes a state of the Union, the law admitting her becomes irrevocable, and thus the controversy terminates forever; if, on the other hand, the people of Kansas shall vote down that proposition, as it is now generally admitted they will, by a large majority, then from that instant the Lecompton constitution is dead, dead beyond the power of resurrection, and thus the controversy terminates. And when the monster shall die I shall be willing, and trust that all of you will be willing, to acquiesce in the death, of the Lecompton constitution. The controversy may now be considered as terminated, for in three weeks from now it will be finally settled, and all the ill-feeling, all the embittered feeling which grew out of it shall cease, unless an attempt should be made in the future to repeat the same outrage upon popular rights. I need not tell you that my past course is a sufficient guarantee that if the occasion shall ever arise again whilst I occupy a seat in the United States senate, you will find me carrying out the same principle, that I have this winter, with all the energy and all the power I may be able to command. I will stand by you, I will stand by you, I will stand by you, I have the gratification

of saying to you that I do not believe that that controversy will ever arise again; first, because the fate of Lecompton is a warning to the people of every territory and of every state to be cautious how the example is repeated, and secondly, because the president of the United States, in his annual message has said that he trusts the example in the Minnesota case, wherein congress passed a law, called an enabling act, requiring the constitution to be submitted to the people for acceptance or rejection, will be followed in all future cases. ("That was right.") I agree" with you that it was right. I said so on the day after the message was delivered, in my speech in the senate on the Lecompton constitution, and I have frequently in the debate tendered to the president and his friends, tendered to the Lecomptonites, my voluntary pledge that if he will stand by that recommendation, and they will stand by it, that they will find me working hand in hand with them in the effort to carry it out. All we have to do, therefore, is to adhere firmly in the future, as we have done in the past, to the principle contained in the recommendation of the president in his annual message, that the example in the Minnesota case shall be carried out in all future cases of the admission of territories into the Union as states. Let that be done and the principle of popular sovereignty will be maintained in all of its vigor and all of its integrity. I rejoice to know that Illinois stands prominently and proudly forward among the states which first took their position firmly and immovably upon this principle of popular sovereignty, applied to the territories as well as to the states. You all recollect when in 1850 the peace of the country was disturbed in consequence of the agitation of the slavery question, and the effort to force the Wilmot Proviso upon all the territories, that it required all the talent and all the energy, all the wisdom, all the patriotism of a Clay and a Webster, united with other

and great party leaders, to devise a system of measures by which peace and harmony could be restored to our distracted country. Those compromise measures eventually passed and were recorded on the statute book, not only as the settlement of the then existing difficulties but as furnishing a rule of action which should prevent in all future time the recurrence of like evils, if they were firmly and fairly carried out. Those compromise measures rested, as I said in my speech at Chicago, on my return home that year, upon the principle that every people ought to have the right to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the constitution. They were founded upon the principle that, while every state possessed that right under the constitution, that the same right ought to be extended to and exercised by the people of the territories. When the Illinois legislature assembled, a few months after the adoption of these measures, the first thing the members did was to review their action upon this slavery agitation, and to correct the errors into which their predecessors had fallen. You remember that their first act was to repeal the Wilmot proviso instructions to our U. S. senators,

which had been previously passed, and in lieu of them to record anptSer ??5solution upon the
 ^journal, with which yMTmuSt" all be familiar a resolution brought forward by Mr. Ninian Ed-
 wards, and adopted by the house of representa- tives by a vote of 61 in the affirmative to 4 in the negative.
 That resolution I can quote to you in almost its precise language. It declared that the great principle
 of self government was the birth right of freemen ; was the gift of heaven ; was achieved by the
 blood of our revolutionary fath- ers and must be continued and carried out in the organization of all
 the territories and tho admis- sion of all new states. That became the Illinois platform by the united
 voices of the democratic party and of the whig party in 1851; all the whigs and all the democrats in
 the legislature uniting in an affirmative vote upon it and there being only 4 votes in the negative,
 of abolition- ists, of course, (<*<" *' 'iiCJw>y"CoaldBt .Affl*jft| B#!ilse'4a.nd.laiight;'^ That resolu-
 tion stands upon the journal of your legislature to this day and hour unrepealed. as a standing,
 living, perpetual instruction to the senators from Illinois in all time to come to carry out that prin-
 ciple of self government and allow no limitation upon it in tile organization of any territories or the
 admission of any new states. In 1854 when it became my duty as the chairman of the com- mittee
 on territories to bring forward a bill for the organization of Kansas and Nebraska, I in- corporated
 that principle in it and congress pass- ed it, thus carrying the principle into practical effect. I will
 not recur to the scenes which took place all over this country in 1854 when that Ne- braska bill
 passed. I could then travel from Boston to Chicago by the light of my own effigies, inconsequence
 of having stood up for it. jMHn ^i(i-iMt--"-----yfliM." ."Hiaa-rHS-sBftiMfes:'&e'.) I leave it to you to say
 how I met that storm, and whether I quailed under it ; ^mB;^^'i'as'-iBi^ whether I did not "face the
 music,^' justify the principle and pledge my life to carry it out. (ji*3Sow;iHi,":aind-tjiree cheers.:^ ...
 A friend here reminds me, too. that when mak- ing speeches then, justifying the Nebraska bill and
 the great principle of self-government, that I predicted that in loss than five years you would have
 to get out a search warrant to find an anti- Nebraska man. ,^!KhAe#Mgol#&t Well, I believe I did
 make that prediction. I did not claim the power of a prophet, but it occurred to me that among a
 free people, and an honest peo- ple and an intelligent people, that five years was long enough for
 them to come to an understand- ing that the great principle of self-government was right, not only
 in the states, but in the terri- tories. I rejoiced this year to see my prediction, in that respect, carried
 out and fulfilled by the unanimous vote, in one form or another, of both houses of congress If you
 will remember that pending this Lecompton controversy that gallant old Roman, Kentucky's favorite
 son, the wortliy successor of the immortal Clay I allude, as you know, to the gallant John J. Crittenden
 JU'WII!!'. brought forward a bill, now known as the Crit- tended-Montgomery bill, in which it was
 pro- posed that the Lecompton constitution should be referred back to the people of Kansas, to be
 de- cided for or against it, at a fair election, and if a majority of the people were in favor of it, that
 Kansas should come into the Union as a slave- holding state, but that if a majority were against it
 that they should make a uew constitution and come in with slavery or without it, as they thought
 proper. p'That was right." Yes, my dear sir, it was not only right, but it was carrying out the principle

of the Nebraska bill in its letter and in its spirit. Of course I voted for it, ^aTii>j and so did every republican senator and representa- tive in congress. {tmgiliWiii.'j I have found I some democrats so perfectly straight that they blame me for voting for the principle of the Nebraska bill because the republicans voted the same way. f*wr't' feaughtgR- atWfelX'rjild they What did they say ? Why, many of them said that Douglas voted with the republicans. Yes ! not only that, but with the black republicans. ^itoWg'Sgarinjfglrteri^ . Well, there are diff'orent modes of stating that proposition. The New York Tribune says that Douglas did not vote with the republicans, but that on that question the republicans went over to Douglas and voted with My friends, I have never yet abandoned a prin- ciple because of the support, I found men yield- ing to it, and I shall never abandon my demo- cratic principles, merely because republicans come to them. i;fir.8aj.,iaitete8t - For what do we travel over the country and make speeches in every political canvass, if it .is not to enlighten the minds of these republicans; piGoadj^i-^reat 4ag}rtwn<J "clvew,- to remove the scales from their eyes, and to impart to them the light of di mocratic vision, so that they may be able to carry out the constitution of our country as our fathers made it. ^iijfiaaAngaad.i'Jt And if by preaching our principles to the people we succeed in convincing the republicans of the errors of their ways, and bring them over to us, are_we bound to turn traitors to our principles,/merely ..because they give them their support? . ! >AiMeM!9&) i6lweireei*?3 All 1 have to say is that I hope the Republican party will stand firm, in the future, by the vote they gave on the Crittendeu-Mont- gomery bill. jHwwiiWj I hope we will find, in the resolutions of their county and congressional conventions, no declarations of "no more slave states to be admitted into this Union," but in lieu of that declaration that we will find the prin- ciple that the people of every state and every ter- ritory shall come into the Union with slavery or without it, just as they please, without any inter- ference on the part of congress. ^'Thnt'i lihii - My friends, whilst I was at Washington, en-" gaged in this great battle for sound constitutional principles, I find from the newspapers that the republican party of this state assembUd in this capital, in state convention, and not only nom- inated, as it was wise and proper for them to do, a man for my successor in the senate, but laitl down a platform, and their nominee made a speech, carefully written and prepared, and well delivered, which that convention accepted as con- taining the republican creed I have no comment to malie on that part of Mr. Lincoln's speech, in which he represents me as forming a conspiracy with the supreme court and with the late presi- dent of the United States and the present chief magistrate, having for my object the passage of the Nebraska bill, the Dred Scott decision and the extension of slavery a scheme of political tricksters, composed of Chief Justice Taney and his eight associates, t-B'o presidents of the United States, and one senator of Illinois. 4"Hi' him.. ,*gaiBW- otooers and great laughter. If Mr. Lin- coln deems me a conspirator of that kind, all I , have to say is that I do not think so badly of the president of the United States and the supreme court of the United States, the highest judicial tribunal on earth, as to believe that they were capable in their action and decision of entering into political intrigues for partizan purposes. J.hri?aiiti>niitii.ffin'r hnm giT-n -fir th- unprrrmr . ftaiBi*isfe&ajttaJtoi^&tal*- I therefore shall only notice those parts of Mr.

Lincoln's speech, in which he lays down his platform of principles and tells you what he intends to do if he is elected to the senate of the United States. An old gentleman here rose on the platform and said: "Be particular now Judge, be particular." Mr. Douglas: My venerable friend here says that he will be gratified if I will be particular, and in order that I may be so I will read the language of Mr. Lincoln as reported by himself and published to the country. (i>AiftaoA)'gPwM^ Mr. Lincoln lays down his main proposition in these words : " 'A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Union cannot endure permanently half free and half slave. I do not expect the Union will be dissolved, I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it to cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other." (tiimgh*oini) Mr. Lincoln does not think this Unjon can continue to exist composed of half slave and half free states; they must all be free or all slave. (M-Xihatia.i ahnlit'?" ^-^""") I do not doubt that this is Mr. Lincoln's conscientious conviction. (linMigp luO^t I do not doubt that he thinks it is the highest duty.of every patriotic citizen to preserve this glorious Union, and to adopt these measures as necessary to its preser- vation. He tells you that the only mode to pre- serve the Union is to make all the states free or all slave. (" finrl fnrhidi")- It must be the one or it must be the other. Now that being essen- tial, in his estimation, to the preservation of this glorious Union, how is he going to accomplish it. He says that he wants to go to the Senate in order to carry out this favorite patriotic policy of his, of making all the states free, so that the house shall no longer be divided against itself. (G*w>it teuglil^i'i'.^ When he gets to the Senate loy what means is he going to accomplish it? By an act of Congress. Will he contend that Con- gress has any power under the Constitution to abolish slavery in any state of this Union, or to interfere with it directly or indirectly. Of course he will not contend that, -f" IT.....I fnr T>(ii>g- Hf^') Then what is to be his mode of carrying out his principle, by which slavery shall be abolished in all the states. Mr. Lincoln cer- tainly does not speak at random. He is a law- yer, an eminent lawyer, and his profession is

\ i %\ '"

aiiill ,/ to know the vemediy tor every jivrong. What is his remedy for this imaginary wrong which he supposes to exist. The Constitution of the United States provides that it may be amended by Congress passing an amendment by a two- thirds majority of each house, which shall be ratitied by three-fourths of the states, and the inference is that Mr. Lincoln intends to carry this slavery agitation into Congress with the view of amending the Constitution so that slavery can be abolished in all the states of the Union. In other words he is not going to allow one portion of the Union to be slave and another portion to be free; he is not going to permit the house to "be divided against itself. (| i' IIBnnwBi't- 'MhpaM*'^ He is going to remedy it by lawful and constitutional means. What are to be these means ? How can he abolish slavery in tliose states where it exists ? There is but one mode by which a political organization, composfd of men in the free states, can abolish glavevy in

the slaveholding states, and that would be to abolish the state Legislatures, blot out of existence the state sovereignties, invest Congress with full and plenary power over all the local and domestic and police regulations of the different states of the Union. Then there would be uniformity in the local concerns and domestic institutions of the different states; then the house would no longer be divided against itself; then the states would all be free, or they would all be slave, then you would have uniformity prevailing throughout this whole land in the local and domestic institutions, but it would be a uniformity, not of liberty but a uniformity of despotism that would triumph. (I'll submit to you, my fellow citizens, whether this, is not the logical consequence of Mr. Lincoln's proposition, (which I have called on Mr. Lincoln to explain what he did mean, if he did not mean this, and he has made a speech at Chicago, in which he attempts to explain. And how does he explain? I will give him the benefit of his own language, precisely as it was reported in the republican papers of that city, after undergoing his revision, "I have said a hundred times, and have no inclination to take it back, that I believe there is no right and ought to be no inclination in the people of the free states to enter into the slave states and interfere with the question of slavery at all." He believes there is no right on the part of the free people of the free states to enter the slave states and interfere with the question of slavery, hence he does not propose to go into Kentucky and stir up a civil war and a servile war between the blacks and the whites. All he proposes is to invite the people of Illinois and every other free state to band together as one sectional party, governed and divided by a geographical line, to make war upon the institution of slavery in the slaveholding states. He is going to carry it out by means of a political party, that has its adherents only in the free states; a political party, that does not pretend that it can give a solitary vote in the slave states of the Union, and by this sectional vote he is going to elect a president of the United States, form a cabinet and administer the government on sectional grounds, being the power of the north over that of the south. In other words, he invites a war of the north against the south, a warfare of the free states against the slaveholding states. He asks all men in the free states to conspire to exterminate slavery in the southern states so as to make them all free, and then he notifies the south that unless they are going to submit to our efforts to exterminate their institutions, they must band together and plant slavery in Illinois and every northern state. He says that the states must all be free or must all be slave. On this point I take issue with him directly, I assert that Illinois has a right to decide the slavery question for herself. We have decided it, and I think we have done it wisely, but whether wisely or unwisely it is our business, and the people of no other state have any right to interfere with us directly or indirectly. Claiming as we do this right for ourselves we must concede it to every other state to be exercised by them respectively. Now, Mr. Lincoln says, that he will not enter into Kentucky to abolish slavery there, but that all he will do is to fight slavery in Kentucky from Illinois. He will not go over there to set fire to the match. I do not think he would. Mr. Lincoln is a very prudent man. He would not deem it wise to go over into Kentucky to stir up this strife but he would do



it from this side of the river. ^aMantj gliitMtDillli lti i.lig: Permit me to inquire whether the wrong, the out- rage of interference by one state with the local concerns of another is worse when you actually invade them than it would be if you carried on the warfare from another state. For the purpose of illustration, suppose the British government should plant a battery on the Niagara river op- posite Buffalo and throw their shells over into Buffalo, where they should explode and blow up the houses and destroy the town. We call the British government to an account and they say, in the language of Mr. Lincoln, we did not enter into the limits of the United States to interfere with you, ^f| ttaAjbJu^;UiMP^ we planted the bat- tery on our own soil and had a right to shoot from our own soil, and if our shells and balls fell in Buffalo and killed your inhabitants, why, it is your lookout not ours. Thus, Mr. Lincoln is going to plant his abolition batteries all along the banks of the Ohio river and throw his shells into Virginia and Kentucky and into Missouri, and blow up the institution of slavery, and when we arraign him for his unjust interference with the institutions the other states, he says, "Why, I never did enter into Kentucky to interfere with her; I do not propose to do it, I only propose to take care of my own head by ^keeping on this side: of the river, out of harm's way." (Slw*Mtafe_ laiHi^lilililililililililil, ^l>a9:) But yet, he says he is go- ing to persevere in this system of sectional war- fare, and I have no doubt he is sincere in what he says, ^imughtian..) He says that the existence of the Union depends upon his success in firing in- to these slave states until he exterminates them. iftfawi uMMSg^tt^y He says that unless hK shall play his batteries successfully, so as to abol- ish slavery in every one of the states, that the Union .shall be dissolved; i^tattsteui^ ^itd he says that a dissolution of the Union would be a terrible calamity. Of course it would. We are all friends of the Union. We all believe I do that our lives, our liberties, our hopes in the future de- pend upon the preser.yation and perpetuity of this glorious Union. I believe that the hopes of the friends of liberty throughout the world depend up- on the perpetuity of the American Union. (.i*jl^ffi -Jio;S=a53sSate<9,-Mrtfesgig| P,) But while I believe that my mode of preserving the Union is a very different one from that of Mr. Lincoln, I believe that the Union can only be preserved by maintaining inviolate the constitution of the U. . S. a,i l'U,-f .thcrshave made it. ("SSiSiisJfiS.smi' ""ihtlft"") That constitution guarantees to the people of every state the right to have slavery or not have it; to have negroes or not have them; to have Maine liquor laws or not have them; to have just such institutions as they choose, each state being left free to decide for itself. -(liitiHttriMji'taBtoy!-. luiliilifthidMii) The framers of that constitution never conceived the idea that uniformity in the domestic institutions of the different states was either desirable or possible. They well under- stood that the laws and institutions which would be well adapted to the granite hills of New Hamp- shire would be unfit for the rice plantations of South Carolina ; they well understood that each one of the thirteen states had distinct and sepa- rate interests, and required distinct and separate local laws and local institutions. ,^3!ba*. '-sSHd ^tmiimmf ijiCTywik4ar.BongiaS'.') And in view of that fact they provided that each state should retain its sovereign power within its own limits, with the right to make just sitch laws and just such institutions as it saw proper, under the be- lief that no two

of them would be alike. If they had supposed that uniformity was desirable and possible, why did they provide for a separate legislature for each state? Why did they not blot out state sovereignty and state legislatures, and give all the power to congress, in order that the laws might be uniform? For the very reason that uniformity, in their opinion, was neither desirable or possible. We have increased from thirteen states to thirty-two states, and just in proportion as the number of states increases and our territory expands, there will be a still greater variety and dissimilarity of climate, of production, and of interest, requiring a corresponding dissimilarity and variety in the local laws and institutions adapted thereto. The laws that are necessary in the mining regions of California, would be totally useless and vicious on the prairies of Illinois; the laws that would suit the lumber regions of Maine or of Minnesota, would be totally useless and valueless in the tobacco regions of Virginia and Kentucky; the laws which would suit the manufacturing districts of New England, would be totally unsuited to the planting regions of the Carolinas, of Georgia and of Louisiana. Each state is supposed to have interests peculiar and distinct from each and every other, and hence must have laws different from each and every other state, in order that its laws shall be adapted to the condition and necessities of the people. Hence I insist that our institutions rest on the theory that there shall be dissimilarity and variety in the local laws and institutions of the different states instead of all being uniform; and you find, my friends, that Mr. Lincoln and myself differ radically and totally on the fundamental principles of this government. He goes for consolidation, for uniformity in our local institutions, for blotting out state rights and state sovereignty, and consolidating all the power in the federal government, for converting these thirty-two sovereign states into one empire, and making uniformity throughout the length and breadth of the land. On the other hand, I go for maintaining the authority of the federal government within the limits marked out by the constitution, and then for maintaining and preserving the sovereignty of each and all of the states of the Union, in order that each state may regulate and adopt its own local institutions in its own way, without interference from any power whatsoever. Thus you find there is a distinct issue of principles—principles irreconcilable between Mr. Lincoln and myself. He goes for consolidation and uniformity in our government. I go for maintaining the confederation of the sovereign states under the constitution, as our fathers made it, leaving each state at liberty to manage its own affairs and own internal institutions. A. A. /

aaaa PH ^iT < ili

Mr. Lincoln makes another point upon me. He says that the supreme bench to till Chief Justice and rests his whole case upon these two points. Tauey's place, {T-ae.w;aii laJMsiiWi^ and when His last point is, that he will wage a warfare upon me applied to Seward, the latter would say, "Mr. Lincoln on the supreme court of the United States be—Lincoln I cannot appoint you until I know how cause of the Dred Scott decision. He takes on— you will decide the Dred Scott case?" Mr. Lincoln, in his speech made

before the republican coin tells him, and then asks him how he will convention, in my absence, to arraign me, not decide Tom Jones' case, and Bill Wilson's case, only for having expressed my acquiescence in and thus catechizes the judge as to how he will that decision, but to charge me with being aeon- decide any case which may arise before him. spirator with that court in devising that decision Suppose you get'a supreme court composed of three years before Dred Scott ever thought of such judges, who have been appointed by a par- oommeneing a suit for his freedom, flauⁱ^htuii tizan president upon their giving pledges how The object of his speech was to convey the idea tiiey would decide a case before it arose '-!-'*

J confidence would you have such what a court! to the people that the court could not be trusted that the late president could not be trusted, that ____ . ^ the preseat one could not be trusted, and that Would not your court be prostituted beneath Mr. Douglas could not be trusted; that they were the conlemt of all mankind ! What man would all conspirators in bringing about that corrupt feel that his liberties were safe ; his right of per- decision, to which Mr. Lincoln is determined he son or property was secure if the supreme bench, will never yield a willing obedience. "lat august tribunal, the highest on earth, was He makes two points upon the Dred Scott de- brought down to that low, dirty pool wherein the cision. The first is that he objects to it because judges are to give pledges m advance how they the court decided that negroes descended of slave wi'll decide all the questions which may be brought parents are not citizens of the United States; and b'fo'e iliem (iiiifa*aU**gl.") Itis a prop secondly, because they have decided that the act osition to make that court the corrupt, unserupu of congress, passed 8th of March, 1820, prohibit ing slavery in all of the territories north of 36 30', was unconstitutional and void, and henoo did not have effect in emancipating a slave brought into that territory. And he will not submit to that decision. He says that he will not fight the judges or the United States marshals in order to liberate Dred Scott, but that he will not respect' that decision, as a rule of law binding on this country,^in the future. Why not ? Because, he says, it is unjust. How is he going to remedy it ? Why, he says he is going to reverse it. How ? He is going to take an appeal. To whom is he going to appeal? fj*(g+rt*i The constitution of the United States provides that the supreme court is the ultimate tribunal, the highest judi- cial tribunal on earth, and Mr. Lincoln is going to appeal from that. To whom ? I know he ap- pealed to the republican state convention of Hli- nois, pmigh*eiV-fand I believe that convention reversed the decision, but I am not aware that they have yet carried it into effect. -pReawed** laa^tet-J- How are they going to make that reversal effectual ? Why, Mr. Lincoln tells us in his late Chicago speech. He explains it as clear as light. He says to the people of Illinois that If you elect him to the senate he will introduce a bill to re enact the law which the court pro- nounced unconstitutional. Shouts of laughter, and voices "spot the law." Yes, he is going to spot the law. The court pronounces that law, prohibiting slavery, unconstitutional and void, and Mr. Lincoln is going to pass an act reversing that decision and making it valid. I never heard before of an appeal being taken from the supreme court to the congress of the United States to re-

verse its decision. I have heard of appeals being taken from congress to the supreme court to declare a statute void. That has been done from the earliest days of Chief Justice Marshall, down to the present time. The supreme court of Illinois do not hesitate to pronounce an act of the legislature void, as being repugnant to the constitution, and the supreme court of the United States is vested by the constitution with that very power. The constitution says that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in the supreme court, and such inferior courts as congress shall, from time to time, ordain and establish. Hence it is the province and duty of the supreme court to pronounce judgment on the validity and constitutionality of an act of congress. In this case they have done so, and Mr. Lincoln will not submit to it, and he is going to reverse it by another act of congress of the same tenor. My opinion is that Mr. Lincoln ought to be on the supreme bench himself, when the republicans get into power, if that kind of law knowledge qualifies a man for the bench. But Mr. Lincoln intimates that there is another mode by which he can reverse the Dred Scott decision. How is that? Why, he is going to appeal to the people to elect a president who will appoint judges who will reverse the Dred Scott decision. Well, let us see how that is going to be done. First, he has to carry on his sectional organization, a party confined to the free states, making war upon the slaveholding states until he gets a republican president elected. "He never will, sir, - am*- a>y,hl..yMiniiiiingii I do not believe he ever will J- Era. J "TTOltpr>iui-ii But suppose he should; I^hirthat*republican president shall have taken his seat, (Mr. Seward, for instance,) will he then ' proceed to appoint judges? No! he will have to wait until the present judges die before he call do that, and perhaps his four years would be out before a majority of these judges found it agreeable to die;-WraHttefc.jaa)aiUaiiw-t^ and it is very possible, too, that Mr. Lincoln's senatorial term would expire before these judges would be accommodating enough to die. ^tjatot'o righ*.-j If it should so happen I do not see a very great prospect for Mr. Lincoln to reverse the Dred Scott decision. But suppose they should die, then how are the new judges to be appointed. Why the republican president is to call up the candidates and catechize them, and ask them, "How will you decide this case if I appoint you judge?" ffnuTr-T*J*iti'i*i Suppose, for Mr Lincoln to be a vicious tool of a political party. But Mr. Lincoln does not conscientiously submit he thinks to the decision of a court composed of a majority of democrats. If he cannot, how can he expect us to have confidence in a court composed of a majority of republicans, selected for the purpose of deciding against the democracy, and in favor of the republicans? (attoOTCL) The very proposition carries with it the demoralization and degradation destructive of the judicial department of the federal government. I say to you, fellow citizens, that I have no warfare to make upon the supreme court because of the Dred Scott decision. I have no complaints to make against that court, because of that decision. My private opinions on some points of the case may have been one way and on other points of the case another; in some things concurring in instance. with the court and in others dissenting, but what have my private opinions in a question of law to do with the decision after it has been pronounced by the highest judicial tribunal known to the constitution, (Jikicmr) You, sir, addressing the chairman, as

an eminent lawyer, have a right to entertain your opinions on any question that comes before the court and to appear before the tribunal and maintain them boldly and with tenacity until the final decision shall have been pronounced, and then, sir, whether you are sustained or overruled your duty as a lawyer and a citizen is to bow in deference to that decision. I intend to yield obedience to the decisions of the highest tribunals in the land in all cases whether their opinions are in conformity with my views as a lawyer or not. When we refuse to abide by judicial decisions what protection is there left for life and property? To whom shall you appeal? -To mob law, to partisan caucuses, to town meetings, to revolution? Where is the remedy when you refuse obedience to the constituted authorities? I will not stop to inquire whether I agree or disagree with all the opinions expressed by Judge Taney or any other judge. It is enough for me to know that the decision has been made. It has been made by a tribunal appointed by the constitution to make it; it was a point within their jurisdiction, and I am bound by it. But, my friends, Mr. Lincoln says that this Dred Scott decision destroys the doctrine of popular sovereignty, for the reason that the court has decided that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in the territories, and hence he infers that it would decide that the territorial Legislatures could not prohibit slavery there. I will not stop to inquire whether the court will carry the decision that far or not. It would be interesting as a matter of theory, but of no importance in practice; for this reason, that if the people of a territory want slavery they will have it, if they do not want it they will drive it out, and you cannot force it on them. Slavery cannot exist a day in the midst of an unfriendly people with unfriendly laws. There is truth and wisdom in a remark made to me by an eminent southern Senator, when speaking of this technical right to take slaves into the territories. Said he, "I do not care a fig which way the decision shall be, for it is of no particular consequence; slavery cannot exist a day or an hour in any territory or state unless it has affirmative laws sustaining and supporting it, furnishing police regulations and remedies, and an omission to furnish them would be as fatal as a constitutional prohibition. Without affirmative legislation in its favor slavery could not exist any longer than a new born infant could survive under the heat of the sun on a barren rock without protection. It would wilt and die for the want of support." So it would be in the territories... 'See the illustration in Kansas. The Republicans have told you, during the whole history of that territory, down to last winter, that the pro-slavery party in the legislature had passed a pro-slavery code, establishing and sustaining slavery in Kansas, but that this pro-slavery legislature did not truly represent the people, but was imposed upon them by an invasion from Missouri, and hence the legislature were one way and the people another. Granting all this, and

: WI

X v\

what has been the result? With laws supporting slavery, but the people against, there is not US many slaves in Kansas to-day as there were on the day the Nebraska bill passed and the Missouri compromise was repealed, ^finnrn. Why? Simply because slave owners knew that if they took their slaves into Kansas, where a majority of the people were opposed to slavery, that it would soon be abolished, and they would lose their right of property in consequence of taking them there. For that reason they would not take or keep them there. If there had been a majority of the people in favor of slavery and the climate had been favorable, they would have taken them there, but the climate not being suitable, the interest of the people being opposed to it, and a majority of them against it, "the slave owner did not find it profitable to take his slaves there, and consequently there are not as many slaves there to-day as on the day the Missouri Compromise was repealed. This shows clearly that if the people do not want slavery they will keep it out and that if they do want it they will protect it. XYou have a good illustration of this in the territorial history of this state. You all remember that by the ordinance of 1787 slavery was prohibited in Illinois, yet you all know, particularly you old settlers, who were here in territorial times, that the territorial legislature, in defiance of that ordinance, passed a law allowing you to go into Kentucky, buy slaves and bring them into the territory, having them sign indentures to serve you and your posterity 99 years, and their posterity thereafter to do the same. This hereditary slavery was introduced in defiance of the act of congress. That was the exercise of popular sovereignty, the right of a territory to decide the question for itself in defiance of the act of congress. On the other hand, if the people of a territory are hostile to slavery they will drive it out. Consequently this theoretical question raised upon the Dred Scott decision, is worthy of no consideration whatsoever, for it is only brought into these political discussions and used as a hobby upon which to ride into office, or out of which to manufacture political capital. But Mr. Lincoln's main objection to the Dred Scott decision, I have reserved for my conclusion. His principal objection to that decision is that it was intended to deprive the negro of the rights of citizenship in the different states of the Union. Well, suppose it was, and there is no doubt that that was its legal effect, what is his objection to it? Why, he thinks that a negro ought to be permitted to have the rights of citizenship. He is in favor of negro citizenship, and opposed to the Dred Scott decision, because it declares that a negro is not a citizen, and hence is not entitled to vote. Here I have a direct issue with Mr. Lincoln. I am not in favor of negro citizenship^ (ri'Mj|iPlt".j;ftaiHittd*I-tb-ero-wd, iilitwwrtfSrTriref m's,"-*'goodv good,"-*,) I do not believe that a negro is a citizen or ought to be a citizen. (,;,'JlJirrah.4;a)j .Jlaiigla*f*^ I believe that this government of ours was founded, and wisely founded, upon the white basis. {! ^mi*U^xi^;X.;^i3SS!lt^L""SsTWf^t^i,^^s^ It was made by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity, to be executed and managed by white men, (~iiaionyto }>)" 'flluuMth vfo^JiBi*gisk %Si.ajid..geBA.appla,HSe.) I freely concede that humanity requires us to extend all the protection, all the privileges, all the immunities, to the Indian and the negro which they are capable of enjoying

consistent with the safety of society. (**Th'af--*iglrfc") You may then ask me what are those rights, what is the nature and extent of the rights which a negro ought to have. My answer is that this is a question for each state and each territory to decide for itself. (.A>0<igd--i>) In Illinois we have decided that a negro is not a slave, but we have at the same time determined that he is not a citizen and shall not enjoy any political rights. (i.TlkiT ' ll;^hl ") I concur in the wisdom of that policy and am content with it. {Jilltniuih for pouglnnii^} I assert that the sovereignty of Illinois had a right to determine that question as we have decided it, and I deny that any other state has a right to interfere with us or call us to account for that decision. If the state of Maine they have decided by their constitution that the negro shall exercise the elective franchise and hold office on an equality with the white man. Whilst I do not concur in the good sense or correct taste of that decision on the part of Maine, I have no disposition to quarrel with her. It is her business and not ours. 'If the people of Maine desire to be put on an equality with the negro, (Inightoi^I do not know that anybody in this state will attempt to prevent it. (-i^'JJ^i.**, If the white people of Maine think a negro is their business. There is a great deal of philosophy and good sense in a saying of Pridley of Kane. Fridley had a law suit before a justice of the peace, and the justice decided it against him. This he did not like, and standing up and looking at the justice for a moment, "Well, Squiare," said he, "if a man chooses to make damnation fool of himself I suppose there is no law against it." AugUtei.) That is all I have to say about these negro regulations and this negro voting in other states where they have systems different from ours. If it is their wish to have it, so be it so. There is no cause to complain. Kentucky has decided that it is not consistent with her safety and her prosperity to allow a negro to have either political rights or his freedom, and hence she makes him a slave. That is her business, not mine. It is her right under the constitution of the country. The sovereignty of Kentucky, and that alone, can decide that question, and when she decides it there is no power on earth to which you can appeal to reverse it. f<Hjjih--fee-.ld.Ka.intttck.!.'). Therefore, leave Kentucky as the constitution has left her, a sovereign, independent state, with the exclusive right to have slavery or not, as she chooses, and so long as I hold power I will maintain and defend her right against any assaults from whatever quarter they may come (Cheess4 I will never stop to inquire whether I approve or disapprove of the domestic institutions of a state. I maintain her sovereign rights I defend her sovereignty from all assault, in the hope that she will join in defending us when we are assailed by any outside power. fW-^WWf^r-goed,." awd^eluMMse^ How are we to protect our sovereign rights, to keep slavery out, unless we protect, the sovereign rights of every other state to decide the question for itself Let Kentucky, or South Carolina, or any other state, attempt to interfere in Illinois and tell us that we shall establish slavery, in order to make it uniform, according to Mr. Lincoln's proposition, throughout the Union. '^n,~|itirr i let them come here and tell us that W3 must and shall have slavery, and I will call on you to follow me and shed the last drop of our heart's blood in repelling the invasion and chastizing their insolence. P^hf"" And if we would fight for our reserved rights and sovereign power in our own limits, we must respect the sovereignty of each

other state, fi -+mt'trt}i.-dotKr*^ Hence, you find that Mr. Lincoln and myself come to a direct issv' ' pn thi's whole doctrine of slavery. He is going to wage a war against it everywhere, not only in Illinois but in his native State of Kentucky. And why ? Because he says that the Declaration of Independence contains this language : "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights ; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and he asks whether that instrument does not declare that all men are created equal. fivN^t^-nig- j(ES.l^ Mr. Lincoln then goes on to say that that clause of the Declaration of Independence includes negroes. "I say not." Well, if you say not I do not think you will vote for Mr. Lin- coln. p.i>ugb*er, and-4h-8it'<veie- -"pH-be d -.iidiif I do " Mr Lincoln goes on to argue that the language "all men" included the ne- groes, Indians and all inferior races. In his Chicago speech he says in so many words that it includes the negroes, that they were en- dowed by the Almighty with the right of equal- ity with the white man, and therefore that that right is divine a right under the higher law : that the law of God makes them equal to the white man, and therefore that the law of the white man cannot deprive them of that right. This is Mr. Lincoln's argument. He is conscientious in his belief. I do not question his sincerity, I do not doubt that he, in his conscience, believes that the Almighty made the negro equal to the white man. He thinks that the negro is his brother, syjajigiiecj,,, I do not thmk that the negro ls any kin of mine at all. Jhaagbt^Fitwd'-ehwrsj And here is the difference between us. L believe that the Declaration of Independence, in the words "all men are created equal," was intended to al- lude only to the people of the United States, to men of European birth or descent, being white men, that they were created equal, and hetice that Great Britain had no right to deprive them of their political and religious privileges; but the signers of that paper did not intend to include the Indian or the negro in that declaration, r,Tiovor^".-fca~ for if they had would they not C>i/\- gro their equal, and that he has a right to come and kill their vote by a negro vote, they have a right to think so, I suppose, and I have no dispo- sition to interfere with them. Then, again, pas- sing over to New York, we find in that state they have provided that a negro may vote -provided he holds \$250 worth of property, but that he shall not unless he does; that is to say, they will allow a negro to vote if he is rich, but a poor fel- low they will not allow to vote. In New York they think a rich negro is equal to a white man. Well, that is a matter of taste with them. (igik. ^^i^ If tiiey think so in that state and do not carry the doctrine outside of it and propose to in- terfere with us, I have no quarrel lo make with have been bound to abolish slavery in every state and colony from that day. f"6ert*inly," and . .ojieiejs. Remember, too, that at the time the Declaration was put forth every one of the thirteen colonies were slaveholding colonies; every man who signed that Declaration represented slave- holding constituents. { "nn>ii-A-..l>agl^asr'>J Did those signers mean by that act to charge themselves and all their constituents with having violated the law of God, in holding the negro in an inferior condition to the white man ? "'Nw,'" eertiljittot,'- And yet, if they included ne- gr-ies in that term they were bcund,as conscient:ous men, that day and that hour, not only to have abolished slavery throughout the land, but to have conferred political rights and

privileges on the negro, and elevated him to an equality with the white man. "They did not do it." I know-

ij?*" - 11.1! V ' S?!f5^"

. r. 4- they did not do it, and the very fact that they did not shows that they did not understand the language they used to include any but the white race. Did they mean to say that the Indian, on this continent, was created equal to the white man, and that he was endowed by the Almighty with inalienable rights so sacred that they could not be taken away by any constitution or law that man could pass? Why, their whole action towards the Indian showed that they never dreamed that they were bound to put him on an equality. I am not only opposed to negro equality, but. I am opposed to Indian equality. I am opposed to putting the coolies, now importing into this country, on an equality with us, or putting the Chinese or any inferior race on an equality with us. I hold that the white race, the European race, I care not whether Irish, German, French, Scotch, English, or to what nation they belong, so they are the white race to be our equals. pifto^Artbai^B-the 4iaftU8iey"^7*B4...hears. and I am for placing them, as our fathers did. on an equality with us. f6h^ei>S!'3Emigrautsfrom Europe and their descendants constitute the people of the U.S. fi>. jB*wd'-f>platiSfe'."J"*The declaration of independence only included the white people of the U. S. fiiSt the negrer." The constitution of the U. S. was framed by the white people, it ought to be administered by them, leaving each state to make such regulations concerning the negro as it chooses allowing him political rights or not as it chooses, and allowing him. civil rights or not as it may determine for itself. ^- Let us only carry, out those principles, and we will have peace and harmony in the different states. But Mr. Lincoln's conscientious scruples on this right to govern his action and I honor him for following them, although I abhor the doctrine which he preaches. iiiiiiijhl<>i'j His conscientious scruples lead him to believe that the negro is entitled by divine right to the civil and political privileges of citizenship on an equality with the white man. ^"ibtwft-'fotjteBglssr'^, For that reason he says he wishes the Dred Scott decision reversed. He wishes to confer those privileges of citizenship on the negro. Let us see how he will do it. He will first be called upon to strike out of the constitution of Illinois that clause which prohibits free negroes and slaves from Kentucky for any other state coming into Illinois. When he blots out that clause, when he lets down the door or opens the gate for all the negro population to flow in and cover our prairies until in mid-day they will look dark and black as night, (*i iwgl(4eas^ when we shall have done this, his mission will yet be unfulfilled. Then it will be that he will apply his principles of negro equality, that is if he can get the Dred Scott decision reversed in the meantime. He will then change the constitution again, and allow negroes to vote and hold office, and will make them eligible to the legislature so that thereafter they can have the right men for U. S. senators. ^JiiiMgtlftnj He will

allow them to vote to elect the legislature, the judges and the governor, and will make them eligible to the office of judge or governor, or to the legislature. He will put them on an equality with the white man. What then? Of course, after making them eligible to the judiciary, when he gets Cuffee elevated to the bench, he certainly will not refuse his judge the privilege of marrying any woman he may select! I submit to you whether these are not the legitimate consequences of his doctrine. ^A>.Gartiiia- Jyr" If it be true, as as he says, that by the Declaration of Independence and by Divine law, the negro is created the equal of the white man; if it be true that the Dred Scott decision is unjust and wrong, because it deprives the negro of citizenship and equality with the white man, then does it not follow that if he had the power he would make negroes citizens, and give them all the rights and all the privileges of citizenship on an equality with white men? I think that is the inevitable conclusion. .r~do not doubt Mr. Lincoln's conscientious conviction on the subject, and I do not doubt that he will carry out that doctrine if he ever has the power; but I resist it because I am utterly opposed to any political amalgamation prany other amalgamation on this continent. We are witnessing the result of giving civil and political rights to inferior races in Mexico, in Central America, in South America and in the West India Islands. Those young men who went from here to Mexico to fight the battles of their country in the Mexican war, can tell you the fruits of negro equality with the white man. They will tell you that the result of that equality is social amalgamation, demoralization and degradation, below the capacity for self-government. My friends, if we wish to preserve this government we must maintain it on the basis on which it was established, to wit: the white basis. We must preserve the purity of the race not only in our politics but in our domestic relations. We must then preserve the sovereignty of the states, and we must maintain the federal Union by preserving the federal Constitution inviolate. Let us do that and our Union will not only be perpetual but may extend until it shall spread over the entire continent. Fellow citizens I have already detained you too long. ii"!a oni gii on"d'irost sttyp yet:'^j I have exhausted myself and wearied you, and owe you an apology for the desultory manner in which I have discussed these topics. I will have an opportunity of addressing you again before the November election comes off. id&u.ilWe wetenifSr*'c:' I come to you to appeal to your judgment as American citizens, to take your verdict of approval or disapproval upon the discharge of my public duty and my principles as compared with those of Mr. Lincoln. JkSffie;il,etur.y^" *JulliB>^ If you conscientiously believe that his principles are more in harmony ^W ifia i*<i>li"j with the feelings of the American people and the interests and honor of the republic, elect him. MWo'11But-^4trgi?^er, never."} If, on the contrary, you believe that my principles are more consistent with those great principles upon which our fathers framed this government then I shall ask you to so express your opinion at the polls, -f "JHinfati-foY"Pouglas, vffe *T11 'do it,-" JiBf^ I am aware that it is a bitter and severe contest, but I do not doubt what the decision of the people of Illinois will be. ^iW^Wdwmot-detibt iku,Jt,jttU.he<,.fajt.^u." I do not anticipate any personal collision between Mr. Lincoln and myself. You all know that I am an amiable, good natured man, {"Hnrir"b % Don {>ln,g,". anc} I I take great

pleasure in hearing testimony to the fact that Mr. Lincoln is a kind hearted, amiable, good natured gentleman, with whom no man has a right to pick a quarrel, even if he wanted one. He is a worthy gentleman. I have known him for twenty-five years, and there is no better citizen, and no kinder hearted man. He is a fine lawyer, possesses high ability, and there is no objection to him, except the monstrous revolutionary doctrines with which he is identified and which he conscientiously entertains, and is determined to carry out if he gets the power. " He has one element of strength upon which he relies to accomplish his object, and that is his alliance with certain men in this state claiming to be democrats, whose avowed object is to use their power to prostrate the democratic nominees. "He can't do it," & . He hopes he can secure the few men claiming to be friends of the Lecompton constitution, and for that reason you will find he does not say a word against the Lecompton constitution or its supporters. He is as silent as the grave upon that subject. Behold Mr. Lincoln courting Lecompton votes, in order that he may go to the senate as the representative of republican principles! You know that that alliance exists. I think you will find that it will ooze out before the contest is over. "It must be a contest of principle. Either the radical abolition principles of Mr. Lincoln must be maintained, or the strong, constitutional, national democratic principles with which I am identified must be carried out. I shall be satisfied whatever way you decide. I have been sustained by the people of Illinois with a steadiness, a firmness and an enthusiasm which makes my heart overflow with gratitude. If I was now to be consigned to private life, I would have nothing to complain of. I would even then owe you a debt of gratitude which the balance of my life could not repay. But, my friends, you have discharged every obligation you owe to me. I have been a thousand times paid by the welcome you have extended to me since I have entered the State on my return home this time. Your reception not only discharges all obligations, but it furnishes inducement to renewed efforts to serve you in the future. If you think Mr. Lincoln will do more to advance the interests and elevate the character of Illinois than myself, it is your duty to elect him: if you think he would do more to preserve the peace of the country and perpetuate the Union than myself, then elect him. I leave the question in your hands and again tender you my profound thanks for the cordial and heartfelt welcome tendered to me this evening. I .*,

f ^x^v_je-^2</ ^Z^ /L^i^ Otc lift' (y>^er<^ P^i i

I SPEKHOE" HON. ABRAHAM LINCOLN DELIVERED IN SPBLVGFIELD, SATURDAY EVENING, JULY 17, 1848. , CH^ Fellow Citizens: Another election, which is deemed an important one, is approaching, and, as I suppose, the Republican party will, without much difficulty elect their State ticket. But in regard to the Legislature, we, the Republicans, labor under some disadvantages. In the first place, we have a Legislature to elect upon an apportionment of the representation made several years ago, when the proportion of the population was far greater in the South (as compared

with the North) than it now is; and Inasmuch as our opponents hold almost entire sway in the South, and we a correspondingly Urge majority in the North, the fact that we are now to be represented as we were years ago, when the population was different, is to us a very great disadvantage. We had, in the year 1855 according to law, a census or enumeration of the inhabitants, taken for the purpose of a new apportionment of representation. We know what a fair apportionment of representation upon that census would give us. We know that it could not if fairly made, fail to give the Republican party from six to ten more members of the Legislature than they can probably get as the law now stands. It so happened at the last session of the Legislature, that our opponents, holding the control of both branches of the Legislature, steadily refused to give us such an apportionment as we were rightly entitled to have upon the census already taken. The Legislature steadily refused to give us such an apportionment as we were rightfully entitled to have upon the census taken of the population of the State. The Legislature would pass no bill upon that subject, except such as was at least as unfair to us as the old one, and in which, in some instances, those who will be members of the next Legislature, and will vote for the election of Senator, who are holding over in districts in which we could, on all reasonable calculation, elect men of our own, if we only had the chance of an election. When we consider that there are but twenty five Senators in the Senate, taking two from the side where they rightfully belong and adding them to the other, is to us a disadvantage not to be lightly regarded. Still, so it is; we have this to contend with. Perhaps there "Popular Sovereignty." It is to be labelled is no ground of complaint on our part. In attending upon the cars in which he travels; and upon attending to the many things involved in the last the hacks he rides in; to be flaunted upon the general election for President, Governor, and Archbishops he passes under, and the banners which for Treasurer, Surgeon-General of Public Lands wave over him. It is to be dishd up in as struction, Member of Congress, of the Legislature many varieties as a French cook can produce kitch. County of Berkeley, and so on, we allowed soups from potatoes. Now, as this is so great these things." It is to happen by want of sufficient a staple of the plan of the campaign, it is worth attention, and we have no cause to complain of while to examine it carefully; and if we examine our adversaries, so far as this matter is concerned only a very little, and do not allow ourselves. But we have some cause to complain of solves to have misled, we shall be able to see that the refusal to give us a fair apportionment, the whole thing is the most arrant Quixotism There is still another disadvantage under that was ever enacted before a community, which we labor, and to which I will ask your What is the matter of Popular Sovereignty? attention. It arises out of the relative position. The first thing, in order to understand it, is to compare the two persons who stand before the State as candidates for the Senate. Senator Douglas is of world wide renown. All the anxious politicians of his party, or who have known him, nobody has ever expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank, face, nobody has ever seen that any cabages were sprouting out. Tremendous cheering and laughter. These are disadvantages all, taken together, that the Republicans labor under. We have to fight this battle upon principle, and upon principle alone. I am, in a certain sense, made the standard-bearer

in behalf of the Re- publicans. I was made so merely because" there had to be some one so placed
I bjing in no wise, preferable to any other one of the twenty- five perhaps a hundred we have in
the Re-, publican ranks. Then I say I wish it to be distinctly understood and borne in mind, that we
have to fight this battle without many per- haps without any of the external aids which are brought
to bear against us. So I hope those with whom I am surrounded have prin- ciple enough to nerve
themselves for the task and leave nothing undone, that can'be fairly done, to brrng about the right
result. _After Senator Douglas left Washington, as his movements where made know by the public
prints, he tarried a considerable time in the city of New York; and it was heralded that, like another
Napoleon, he was lying by, and framing the plan of his campaign. It was tel- egraphed to Washington
C ty, and published in the Union that he was framing his plan for the purpose of going to Illinois to
pounce upon and annihilate the treasonable and disunion speech , which Lincoln had made here
on the IGth of June. Now, I do suppose that the Judge really spent some time in New York maturing
the plan of the campaign, as his friends heralded for him. I have been able, by noting his movements
since his arrival in THinois, to dis- two men in the Democratic reaious were allow- cover evidences
confirmatory of that allegation ed to go as lar towards sending a member to I think I have been able
to see what are the the Legislature as three were in the Republican material points of that plan. I
will for a little regions. Cumparisun was made at the time as while, ask your attention to some of
them to representative and senatorial districts, which What I shall point out, though not showing^
completely demonstrated that such was thofjct. the whole plan are nevertheless, the main points"
Such a bill was passed, and tendered to the as I suppose. ' Republican Governor for his signature;
but They are not very numerous. The first is principally for the reasons I have stated, ho Popular
Sovereignty. The second'and third withheld his approval, and the bill tol! without are attacks upon
my speech made on the 16th becoming a law. _ of June. Out of these three points drawinn- Another
disadvantage under which we labor within the range of Popular Sovereignty the is, that there are
one or two Democratic Sena- question of the Lecompton Constitution he makes his principal assault.
Upon these his successive speeches are substantially one and the same. On this matter of Popular
Sover- eignty I wish to be a little careful. Auxiiary to these main points, to be sure, are their thun-
derings of cannon, their marching and music, their fizzlegigs and fireworks; but I will not wa8te_
time with them. They are but the little trappings of the campaign, jiloming to the substance the first
point__ get a .good definition of what it is, and after that to see ho.w it is applied. , I suppose almost
every one knows, that in _____ _ this controversy, whatever has been said has been of his
party for years past, have b-en had reference to the queston of negro slavery. Iwoking upon him
as certainly, at no distant We have not been in a controversy about the day, to be the President of
tiie United States, right of the people to govern themselves in the They have seen in his round jolly
fruitful face, -ordinary matters of domestic concern in the p(-stoffers, landoffers, marsb'alsiilps,
and cabi- ' States and Territories. Mr. Buchanan in one net appointments, ohargeships and foreign
of his late messages, (I think when he sent up mi.^sions; bursting and sprouting out in won- the

Lecompton Constitution,) urged that ^the derful exuberance readv to be laid hold of by main points to which the public attention had ; their greedy hands. Great laughter. And'been directed, was not in regard to the great va- as they have been gazing upon this attractive riety of small domestic matters, but was direct- picture so long, they cannot, in the litfio die- ; ed to the question of negro slavery; and he as- traotictn that has taken place in the party, bring certa, that if the people had had a fair chance themselvS to give up i.he charming hope; but to vote on that question, there was no reason- with greedier anxiety they rush about him, able ground of objection in regard to minor sustain him, and give him marches, triumphal questions. Now, while I think that the people entries, and receptions beyond what even in had not had-gi.'ta, or offered them, a fair the days of his highest prosperity they could chance upon that slavery question; stul, if at in his favor. On the con- thro had been :l fairMibmi^sion to a vote upon lout's pryprn-- i have brought about 0^

m. smm^jma m

.: ; ft t V,' u)d have beer, true to th'e uttermo.-,... .. Uvhen hereufter I speak of popular sovereigaty, I wish to be understood as applying what I say to the question of slavery only, not to other minor domestic matters of a Territory or a State. , ' Does Judge Douglas, when he says that sev eral of the past years of his life have been de-' voted to the question of "popular sovereignty," itnd that all the remainder of his life shall be devoted to it, does he mean to say that he has been devoting his life to securing to the people of the territories the right to exclude slavery from the territories? If he means so to say, he , means to deceive; because he and every one knows that the decision of the Supreme Court, which he approves and makes especial ground of attack upon me for disapproving, forbids the people of a territory to exclude slavery. This ' covers the whole ground, from the setUement of a territory till it reaches the degiee of matu- rity entitling it to form a State Constitution. So far as all that ground is concerned, the Judge is not sustaining popular sovereignty, but absolutely opposing it. He SKStains the decision which declares that the popular will of the territories has lo constitutional power to exclude slavery during their territorial exist- ence. fttwef- This being so, the period of time from the first sertlement of a territory till it reaches the point of forming a State Consti- tution, is not the thing that the Judge has fought for or is fighting for, but on the con- trary, he has fought for, and is fighting for, the thing that annihilates add crushes out that same popular sovereignty. Weil, 80 much being disposed of, what is left? Why, he is contending for the right of the people, when they come to make a State Constitution, to make it fur themselves, and precisely as be-t suits themselves. I say again, that is Quixotic. I defy contradiction when I declare that the Judge can find iio one to op- pose him on that proposition. I repeat, there is n'obody opposing that pronositioo on prinri- pie. Let me not be misunderstood. I kaow that, with leferenee to the Lecompton Consti- tution, I may be misunderstood; but when you understand me correctly, my proposition will be true and acurate. Nobody is opposing, or has opposed, the right of the people,

when they form a Constitution, to form it for themselves. . Mr, Buchanan and his friends have not done it; they, too, as well as the Republicans and the Anti-Loecompton Democrats, have not done it; but, on the contrary, they together have insisted on the right of the people to form a Constitution for themselves. The difference between the Buchanan men on the one hand, and the Douglas men and the Republicans on the other has not been on a question of principle, but on a question of fact. The dispute was upon the question of fact, whether the Loecompton Constitution had been fairly formed by the people or not. Mr. Buchanan and his friends have not contended for the contrary principle any more than the Douglas men or the Republicans. They have insisted that whatever of small irregularities existed in getting up the Loecompton Constitution, were such as happen in the settlement of all new Territories. The question was, was it a fair emanation of the people? It was a question of fact, and not of principle. As to the principle, all were agreed. Judge Douglas voted with the Republicans upon that matter of fact. He and they, by their voices and votes, denied that it was a fair emanation of the people. The Administration affirmed that it was. With respect to the evidence bearing upon that question of fact, I readily agree that Judge Douglas and the Republicans had the right on their side, and that the Administration was wrong. But I state again that as a matter of principle there is no dispute upon the right of a people in a Territory, merging into a State to form a Constitution for themselves without outside interference from any quarter. This being so, what is Judge Douglas going to spend his life for? Is he going to spend his life in maintaining a principle that nobody on earth opposes? ;hears. | Does he expect to stand up in majestic dignity, and go through his apoplexy and become a god, in the maintaining of a principle which neither a man nor a mouse in all God's creation is opposing? *eeajfiflio5 .cbeeriiTg. Now something in regard to the Loecompton Constitution more specially ; for I pass from this other question of popular sovereignty as the most arrant humbug that has ever been attempted on an intelligent community. As to the Loecompton Constitution, I have already said that on the question of fact as to whether it was a fair emanation of the people or not, Judge Douglas with the Republicans and some Americans had greatly the argument against the Administration; and while I repeat this, I wish to know what there is in the opposition of Judge Douglas to the Loecompton Constitution that entitles him to be considered the only opponent to it as being pre excellence the ;...; j, L...a. i a i t t the rightfulness or his opposition. He in the Senate and his class of men there formed the number thirty and no more. In the House of Representatives his class of men -the anti Loecompton Democrats formed a number of about twenty. It took one hundred and twenty to defeat the measure against one hundred and twelve. Of the votes of that one hundred and twenty, Judge Douglas' friends furnished twenty, to add to which, there were six Americans and ninety-four Republicans. I do not say that I am precisely accurate in their numbers, but I am sufficiently so for any use I am making of it. ? Why is it that twenty shall be entitled to all the credit of doing that work, and the hundred none of it? Why, if, as Judge Douglas says, the honor is to be divided and due credit is to be given to other parties, why is just so much given as is consonant with the wishes, the interests and advancement of the

twenty? My understanding is, when a common job is done or a common enterprise prosecuted, if I put in five dollars to your one, I have a right to take out five dollars to your one. But he does not so understand it. He declares the dividend of credit for defeating Lecompton upon a basis which seems unprecedented and incomprehensible. Let us see. Lecompton in the raw was defeated. It afterwards took a sort of cooked up shape, and was passed in the English bill. It is said by the Judge that the defeat was a good and proper thing. If it was a good thing, why is he entitled to more credit than others, for the performance of that good act, unless there was something in the antecedents of the Republicans that might induce every one to expect them to join in that good work, and at the same time, something leading them to doubt that he would? Does he place his superior claim to credit, on the ground that he performed a good act which was never expected of him? He says I have a proneness for quoting scripture. If I should do so now, it occurs that perhaps he places himself somewhat upon the ground of the parable of the lost sheep which went astray upon the mountains and when the owner of the hundred sheep found the one that was lost, and threw it upon his shoulders, and came home rejoicing, it was said that there was more rejoicing over the one sheep that was lost and had been found, than over the ninety and nine in the fold. Verily, I say unto you, there is more rejoicing in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance." And now, if the Judge claims the benefit of this parable, to him repent. Let him not come up here and say: I am the only just person; and you are the ninety-nine sinners! Repentance before forgiveness is a provision of the Christian system, and on that condition alone will the Republicans grant his forgiveness. How will he prove that we have ever occupied a different position in regard to the Lecompton Constitution or any principle in it? He says he did not make his opposition on the ground as to whether it was a free or slave constitution, and he would have you understand that the Republicans made their opposition because it ultimately became a slave constitution. To make provision in favor of himself on this point, he reminds us that he opposed Lecompton before the vote was taken declaring whether the State was to be free or slave. But he forgets to say that our Republican Senator Trumbull, made a speech against Lecompton, even before he did. Why could he not oppose it? Partly, as he declares, because the members of the Convention who framed it were not fairly elected by the people; that the people were not allowed to vote unless they had been registered; and that the people of whole counties in some instances, were not registered. For these reasons he declares the constitution was not an emanation, in any true sense, from the people. He also has an additional objection as to the mode of submitting the constitution back to the people. But bearing on the question of whether the delegates were fairly elected a speech of his, made something more than twelve months ago, from this stand, becomes important. It was made a little while before the election of the delegates who made Lecompton. In that speech he declared there was every reason to hope and believe the election would be fair; and if any one failed

to vote, it would be his own culpable fault. I, a few days after, made a sort of answer to that speech. In that answer, I made, instantly the very argument with which he combated his Lecompton adversaries in the Senate last winter, I pointed to the facts that the people could not vote without being registered, and that the time for registering had _____^, _____ - - , uWB'iiUff" - JUJ^ If '

Il t l 111- 4 |.

" ""iiiiirir': # f^---" ' ; j- -"" .iic.iit-n vii io a,8 wonuenul that Judge Douglas could be ignorant of these facts, which every one else in the nation so well knew. ' ' I now pass from popular sovereignty and Lecompton. I may have occasion to refer to one or both. When he was preparing his plan of campaign, Napoleon like in New York, as appears by two papers I have heard him deliver since his arrival in Illinois, he gave special attention to a speech of mine, delivered here on the 16th of June last. He says that he carefully read that speech. He told us that at Chicago a week ago last night, and he repeated it at Bloomington last night. Doubtless, he repeated it again today, though I did not hear him. In the two first places Chicago and Bloomington I heard him ; to-day I did not. LA. Tois jfats-j.-be saTntie SHSHii+B. I He said he had carefully examined that speech ; when, he did not say ; but there is no reasonable doubt it was when he was in New York preparing his plan of campaign. I am glad he did read it carefully. He says It was evidently prepared with great care. I freely admit it was prepared with care. I claim not to be more free from errors than others perhaps scarcely so much ; but I was very careful not to put anything in that speech as a matter of fact, or make any inferences ! which did not appear to me to be true, and fully warrantable. If, I had made any mistake I was willing to be corrected ; if I had drawn any inference in regard to Judge Douglas, or any one else, which was not warranted, I was fully prepared to modify it as soon as discovered. I planted myself upon the truth and the truth only, so far as I knew it, or could be brought to know it. Having made that speech with the most kindly feeling towards Judge Douglas, as manifested therein, I was gratified when I found that he had carefully examined it, and had detected no error of fact, nor any inference against him, nor any misrepresentations, of which he thought fit to complain. In neither of the two speeches I have mentioned, did he make any such complaint. I will thank any one who will inform me that he, in his speech to day, pointed out anything I had stated, respecting him, as being erroneous. I presume there is no such thing. I have reason to be gratified that the care and caution used in that speech, left it so that the most of all others interested in discovering error, has not been able to point out one thing against him which he could say was wrong. He seizes upon the doctrines he supposes to be included in that speech, and declares that upon them will turn the issues of this campaign. He then quotes, or attempts to quote, from my speech, I will not say that he willfully misquotes, but he does fail to quote accurately. His attempt at quoting is from a passage which I believe I can quote accurately from memory. I shall make the quotation now, with some comments upon it, as I have already said, in order that the Judge shall be left entirely without excuse

for misrepresenting me. I do so now, as I hope, for the last time. I do this in great caution, in order that if he repeats his misrepresentation, it shall be plain to all that he does so willfully. If, after all, he still persists, I shall be compelled to reconstruct the course I have marked out for myself, and draw upon such humble resources as I have for a new course, better suited to the real exigencies of the case I set out in this campaign, with the intention of conducting it strictly as a gentleman, in substance at least, if not in the outside polish. The latter I shall never be, but that which constitutes the inside of a gentleman I hope I understand, and am not less inclined to practice than others.

It was my purpose and expectations that this canvas would be conducted upon principle, and with fairness on both sides, and it shall not be my fault if this purpose and expectation shall be given up. No charges, in substance, that I invite a war of sections; that I propose all the local institutions of the different States shall become consolidated and uniform. What is there in the language of that speech which expresses such purpose, or bears such construction? I have again and again said that I would not enter into any of the States to disturb the institution of slavery. Judge Douglas said, at Bloomington, that I used language most able and ingenious for concealing what I really meant; and that while I had protested against entering into the slave States, I nevertheless did mean to go on the banks of Ohio and throw missiles into Kentucky to disturb them in their domestic institutions. I said, in that speech, and I meant no more, that the institution of slavery ought to be placed in the very attitude which the framers of this Government placed it, and left it. I do not understand that the framers of our Constitution left the people of the free States in the attitude of flinging bombs or shells into the fire. I was not using that passage for the purpose for which he infers I did use it. I said: "We are now far advanced into the fifth year since a policy was created for the avowed object and with the confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion it will not cease till a crisis shall have been reached and passed. 'A house divided against itself can not stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. It will become all one thing or all the other. -Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new. North as well as South." Now you all see, from that quotation, I did not express my wish in anything. In that passage I indicated no wish or purpose of my own; I simply expressed my expectation. Cannot the Judge perceive the distinction between a purpose and an expectation? I have often expressed an expectation to die, but I have never expressed a wish to die. I said at Chicago, and now repeat, that I am quite aware this government has endured, half slave and half free, for eighty-two years I understand that little bit of history. I expressed the opinion I did, because I perceived or thought I perceived a new set of causes introduced. I did say at Chicago, in my speech there, that I do wish to see the spread of slavery arrested and to see it placed where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction. I said

that because I supposed, when the public mind shall rest in that belief, we shall have peace on the slavery question. I have believed and now believe the public mind did rest on that belief up to the introduction of the Nebraska bill. Although I have ever been opposed to slavery, so far I rested in the hope and belief that it was in course of ultimate extinction. For that reason, it had been a minor question with me. I might have been mistaken; but I had believed, and now believe that the whole public mind, that is the mind of the great majority, had rested in that belief up to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. But upon that event, I became convinced that either I had been resting in a delusion, or the institution was being placed on a new basis a basis for making it perpetual, national and universal. Subsequent events have greatly confirmed me in that belief I believe that bill to be the beginning of a conspiracy for that purpose So believing, I have since then considered that question paramount one. So believing, I thought the public mind will never rest till the power of Congress to restrict the spread of it shall, again be acknowledged and exercised on the one hand, or on the other, all resistance be entirely crushed out. I have expressed that opinion, and I entertain it tonight. It is denied that there is any tendency to the nationalization, of slavery in those States. Mr. Brooks, of South Carolina, in one of his speeches, when they were presenting him canes, silver plate, gold pitchers and the like, for assailing Senator Sumner, distinctly affirmed his opinion that when this Constitution was formed, it was the belief of no man that slavery would last to the present day. He said, what I think, that the framers of our Constitution decided the institution of slavery where the public mind rested in the hope that it was in course of ultimate extinction. But he went on to say that the men of the present age, by their experience, have become wiser than the framers of the Constitution; and the invention of the cotton gin had made the perpetuity of slavery a necessity in this country. As another piece of evidence tending to the same point: Quite recently in Virginia, a man the owner of slaves made a will providing that after his death certain of his slaves should have their freedom if they should so choose, and go to Liberia, rather than remain in slavery. They chose to be liberated. But the persons to whom they would descend as property, claimed them as slaves. A suit was instituted, which finally came to the Supreme Court of Virginia, it was therein decided against the slaves, upon the ground that a negro cannot make a choice that they had no legal power to choose could not perform the condition upon which their freedom depended. I do not mention this with any purpose of criticising it, but to connect it with the arguments as affording additional evidence of the change of sentiment upon this question of slavery in the direction of making it perpetual and national. I argue now as I did before, that there is such a tendency, and I am backed up by the facts, but by the open confession in the Slave States

l i i

And now as to the aid payment, on the ground that Congress wish to see slavery placed in the position where it was unconstitutional. The aid payment of ultimate extinction placed where it is - Supreme

Court, and therein it was decided a era ninnally p'accd it-I wish to annihilate that the bank was constitutional. The whole the State Leg[^]slat[^]ures-t.. force cotton to grow Democratic party revolted against that decision upon the. t.vr-) of the Green Mountains-to General Jackson himself asserted that he, [^]s freeze ice in Florida to out Lumber on the President would not be bound to hold a national broad Illinois prairies-that I am in favor of all bank to be ponstit.ional, even though_ the the'e mlic[^]iloL and imnossibio things. Court had deeded it to be so. He ft" F<;>sely Tt seems to me it is a complete answer to all with the view of Mr. -Jefferson, and acted upon thi * to as' if when Con[^]Vers did have tl:o it under his official oath, in vetoing a charter a[^]ionof i;s icHng slavef;fr,mfreeterrito- for a national bank. The declaration tha rvfwhen courts did'have the fashion of decid- Congress does not possess this t>?"-I takin- a slave into a free country power to charter a bank, has gone into the De- ing that m-ide him f-ee-I sav it is a sufficient answer, mocratic platform, at their national conventions, to a4 any of ths ridiculous nonsense about and was brought toward and reaffirmed m their 7-i.- [^] ,L;i.,'if.',[^];tr did actually fol- last convention at Cincinnati. They have consoli[^]auon.[^]aa[^]d[^]un[^],f,[^]muy,[^] contended for that declaration, in the very teeth the'Ordinance'of '87? because of "the Missouri Restriction? because of the numerous court deci'sions of that character? Now, as to the Dred Scott decision ; for upon that he makes his last point at me. He boldly of the Supreme Court, for more than a quarter of a century. In fact, they have reduced the decision to an absolute nuhy. That decision I repeat, is repudiated in the Cincinnati plat- form; and still as if to show that efl'intry can go no farther. Judge Douglas vaunts in tlio takes around in favor of that dfioision. n- --, : j; , , ". _f^{^^} This is one-half the or.slaught, and one-third very speeches in which he detiounces me for of the entire plan of the campaign. I am op- opposing the Drod Scott decision, that he loosed to that decision in a certain sense, but stands on the Cincinnati platform Tot in ?hesre which he Duts on it. I say Now, 1 wisl#to know wha the Judge can "hat in so far as it deededin favor of Dred charge upon me, with respect to decisions of Scott's master and against Dred Scott and his family, I do not propose to disturb or resist the decision I never have proposed to do any such thing. I think, that in respect far judicial authority, my humble history would not suffer in compari- son with thnt of Judge Douglas. He would have the citizen conform his vote to that deci- sion; the Member of Congress, his; the Presi- dent, his ue of the veto power. He would make it a rule of political action for the people and all the departments of the government. I the Supreme Court which does not lie in all its length, breath, and proportions a*, his own door. The plain truth is simply this: Judge Douglas is for Supreme Court decisions when he likes and against them when he dot;s not like them. He is for the Dred Scott decision because it tends to nationalize slavery because it is part of the original combination for that object. It so happens, singularly enough, that I never-Rtood opposed to a decision of the Su- preme Court till this. On the contrary, I have no recollection that he was ever partieulaxly in favor of one till this. He never was in favor woild not. By resisting it as a political rule, ^{^^} ^{^^} ^{^^} opposed to any, till the present ono, I disturb no right of property, create no die. order, excite no mobs. "When he spoke at Chicago, on Friday even-- ing of last week, he made

this same point upon me. On Saturday evening I replied and re minded him of a Supreme Court decision which which helps to nationalize slavery. Free men of Sangamon free men of Illinois free men every where judge ye between him and me, upon this issue. He says this Dred Scott case is a very small matter at most that it has no practical effect; le ^opposed for_ at least several years. _ Last ^i^^t at best, or rather, I suppose, at worst, it is night, at Bloomington, he took some notice of that reply; but entirely forgbt to rememb?r that part of it. He renews his onslaught upon me, forgetting to remember that I have turned the tables against himself on that very point. I renew the effort to draw his attention to it. I wish to stand erect before the country, as well as Judge Douglas, on this question of judicial au- thority; and therefore I add something to the au- thority in .avor of my own position. I wish to show that I am sustained by authority, in ad- but an abstraction. I submit that the proposi- tiofi that tho thiog wMch cletermiiea whether a man is free or a slave, is rather concrete than abstract. I think you would conclude that it was, if your liberty depended upon it, and so woald Jydge Douglas if his liberty depended upon it. But suppose it was on the question of spreading slavery over the new territories that he considers ii as being merely an abstract mittor, and one of no practical importance. How has the planting ofslavery in new countries dition to that heretofore presented. I do not - always been effected? It has now been decided expect to convince the Judge. It is part of the plan of his campaign, and he will cling to it with a desperate gripe. Even, turn it upon him turn the sharp point against him. and gaff'him through he will still cling to it till that slavery cannot bo kept out of our new territories by any legal means. In what does OUT new territories now differ in this respect, from the old colonies when slavery was first planted within them? It was planted as Mr. he can invent some new dodge to take the place' Clay once declared, and as history proves true, by individual men in spite of the wishes of the people; the mother government refusing to prohibit it, and withholding from tho peiple of the colonies the authority to prohibit it for them- selves. Mr. Clay says this was one of the great and just causes of c-„mplaint against Groat Bri- tain by the colonies, and tho best apology we can now make for having the institution amongst ' us.^ In that precise, cimdition our Nebraslsa politicians have at last succeeded in placing oar own new territories; the government will not prohibit slavery within them, nor allow the people to prohibit it. I defy any man to find any difference be- tween the policy which originally planted slavery iu these colonies and that po'licy which now prevails in our new Territories. If it does not go into them, it is only because no individual wishes it to go. The. Judge iudulg. ed himself, doubtless to-day, with the question as to what I am going to do with or about the Dred Scott decision. Well, Judge, will you please tell m<! what you did about the Bank decision? Will you hot graciously allow us to do with the Dred Scott decision precisely as you did with the Bank decision? You succeded in breaking down the moral effect of that deoi- s on; did you find it necessary t) amend the Constitution? or to set up a court of negroes in order to do it? There is one other point. Judge Jlo'jglas has a very affacti(mate leaning t wards the Americans and old Whigs. Last evening, in a sort of weeping tone, he described to us a'death b d scene He had been called to the side of Mr. Clay, in his last momems, in order that tho genius of

popular sovereignty" might duly descend from the dying man and settle upon him, the living and most worthy successor. He could do no less than promise that he would devote the remainder of his life to "popular sovereignty;" and then the great statesman departed in peace. By this part of the plan of it. In public speaking it is tedious reading from documents; but I must beg to indulge the practice to a limited extent. I shall read from a letter written by Mr. Jefferson in 1820, and now to be found in the seventh volume of his correspondence, at page 177. It seems he had been presented by a gentleman of the name of Jarvis with a book, or essay, or periodical, called the "Republican," and he was writing in acknowledgement of the present, and noting some of its contents. After expressing the hope that the work will produce a favorable effect upon the minds of the young, he proceeds to say-- "That it will have this tendency may be expected, and for that reason I feel an urgency to note what I deem an error in it, the more requiring notice as your opinion is strengthened by that of many others. You seem in page 84 and 148, to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions a very dangerous doctrine indeed and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. Our judges are as honest as other men, and not more so. They have, with others, the same passions for party, for power, and the privilege of their corps. Their maxim is, "boni judicis est ampliari jurisdictionem;" and their power is the more dangerous as they are in office for life, and not responsible, as the other functionaries are, to the elective control. The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots. It has more wisely made all the departments co-equal and co-sovereign with themselves. Thus we see the power claimed for the Supreme Court by Judge Douglas, Mr. Jefferson holds, would reduce us to the despotism of an oligarchy. Now, I have said no more than this in fact, never quite so much as this at least I am sustained by Mr. Jefferson. Let us go a little further. You remember we once had a national bank. Since one owed the bank a debt; he was sued and sought to CJ/

.jmuf

"^JitsfeK 1., Judf>;e has evidently promised--<Bu iuincj-i i::ai Liars shall be drawn down the cheeks of all old Wigs, as large as half grown apples. Mr. Webster, too, was mentioned; but it did not quite come to a death-bed scene, as to him. It would be amusing, if it were not disgusting, to see how quick these compromise-breakers administer on the political effects of their dead adversaries, trumping up claims never before heard of, and dividing the assets among themselves. If I should be found dead to-morrow morning, nothing but my insignificance could prevent a speech being made on my authority, before the end of next week. It so happens that in that "popular sovereignty" with which Mr. Clay was identified, the Missouri Compromise was expressly reserved; and it was a little singular if Mr. Clay cast his mantle upon Judge Douglas on purpose to have that compromise repealed. Again, the Judge did not keep faith with Mr. Clay when he first brought in his Nebraska

bill. lie lefu the Missouri Compromise un- repealed, and in his report accompanying the , bill, he told the world he did it on purpose. ' The manes of Mr. Clay must have been in great agony, till thirty days later, when " popular sovereignty" stood forth in all its glory. One more thing. Last night Judge Douglas tormented himself with horrors about my dis- position to make negros perfectly equal with white men iu social and political relations. He did not stop to show that I have said any such thing, or that it legitimately follows from any thiig I have sa'd, hut he rushes on with his as- serti-ms. I adhere to the Declaration of Inde- pendence. If Judge Douglas and his friends are not willing to stand by it, let them come up and amend it. Let them make it read that all men are created equal except negTOOS. Let us have it decided, whether the Dechtration of In- dependence, in this blessed year of 1858. shnll . be thus amended. In his oonstruutiim of the Declaration last year he said it on'y meant that Americana in America were equal to En- lislmen in England. Then, when 1 pointed out to him that by that rule he excludes the Germans, the Irish, the Portuguese, and all the other people who have come amongst us since the Revolution, he reconstructs his construe^ tion. In his last speech he tells us it meant Europeans. I press him a little further, and ask if it meant to include the Russians in Asia? or does he mean to exclude that vast population from the principles of our Declaration of Indepen- dence? I expect ere long he will introduce another amendment to his df-finitin. He is not at all particular. He is satisfied with any thing Vv'hich di.es not endanger the nationaliz- ing of negro slavery. It may draw white men down, but it must not lift negroes up. Who shall say, "I am the superior, and you are the inferior?" My declarations upon this subject of negro slavery may be misrepresented, but can not be misunderstood. I have said that I do not un- derstand the Declaration to mean that all men were created equal m all respects. They are not our equal in color; but I suppose that it (ioes mean to declare that all men are equal in some respects; they are equal in their right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Certainly the negro is not our equal in color perhaps not in many other respf'Cts ; still, in the right to put into his mouth the bread that his own hands have earned, he is the equal of every other man, white cr black. In p'juting out that more has been given you, you can not ' be justiied in taking away the little which has been given him. All I ask for the negro is' that if vou do not like nini, let him alone. If God gave him but little, that tittle let him en joy. When our Government was established, we had the institution of slavery among us. Wo were in a certain sense compelled to tolerate its existence. It was a sort of necessity. We had gone through our struggle and secured our own independence. The framers of the Constitution found the institution of slavery amongst their other institutions at the time. They found that by an eiFiu-t to eradicate it, they might hise much of what thsy had already gained. They were obliged to bow to the necestity. They gave power to Congress to abolish the slave trade at the end of twenty years. They also prohibited it in the Territories where it did no# exist. They did what they could and yielded to the necessity for the rest. I also yield to all which follows from that necessity. What I would most desire would be the separa~ tion of the white and black races. One more point on this SpringSeld speech which Judge Douglas says he has read so care- fully. I expressed my belief in the

existence of a conspiracy to perpetuate and nationalize slavery. I did not profess to know it, nor do I now. I showed the part Judge Douglas had played in the string of facts, constituting to my mind; the proof of that, conspiracy. I showed the parts played by others. I charged that the people had been deceived into carrying the last Presidential election, by the impression that the people of the Territories might exclude slavery if they chose, when it was known in advance by the conspirators, that the Court was to decide that neither Congress nor the people could so exclude slavery. These charges are more distinctly made than any thing else in the speech. Judge Douglas has carefully read and re-read that speech. He has not, so far as I know contradicted those charges in the two speeches which I heard he certainly did not. On his own tacit admission I renew that charge. I charge him with having been a party to that conspiracy and to his deception for the sole purpose of nationalizing slavery. Mr. Lincoln said to Mr. Judd after the meeting of the 9th of July

“I am not prepared to make an arrangement with you and myself to divide time, and address the same audiences the present canvass? Mr. Judd, who will hand you this, is authorized to receive your answer; and, if agreeable to you, to enter into the terms of such arrangement. Your obedient servant, A. Lincoln.”

^ /-c^ ^

The following is the correspondence between the two rival candidates for the United States Senate: MR. LINCOLN TO MR. DOUGLAS. Chicago, Ill., July 24, 1858. Hon. S. A. Douglas My Dear Sir: Will it be agreeable to you to make an arrangement for you and myself to divide time, and address the same audiences the present canvass? Mr. Judd, who will hand you this, is authorized to receive your answer; and, if agreeable to you, to enter into the terms of such arrangement. Your obedient servant, A. Lincoln. MR. DOUGLAS TO MR. LINCOLN. Chicago, July 24, 1858. Hon. A. Lincoln. Dear Sir: Your note of this date, in which you inquire if it would be agreeable to me to make an arrangement to divide the time and address the same audiences during the present canvass, was handed me by Mr. Judd. Recent events have interposed difficulties in the way of such an arrangement. I went to Springfield last week for the purpose of conferring with the Democratic State Central Committee upon the mode of conducting the canvass, and with them, and under their advice, made a list of appointments covering the entire period until late in October. The people of the several localities have been notified of the times and places of the meetings. Those appointments have all been made for Democratic meetings, and arrangements have been made by which the Democratic candidates for Congress, for the Legislature, and other offices will be present and address the people. It is evident, therefore, that these various candidates, in connection with myself, will occupy the whole time of the day and evening, and leave no opportunity for other speeches. , , Besides, there is another consideration which should be kept in mind. It has been suggested recently that an arrangement had been made to bring out a third candidate for the United States Senate, who, with your assent, should canvass the State in opposition to me, with no other purpose than to insure my defeat, by dividing the Democratic party for your benefit. If I should make this arrangement with

you, it is more than probable that this other candidate, who has a common object with you, would desire to become a party to it, and claim the right to speak from the same stand ; so that he and you in concert might be able to take the opening and closing speech in every case. I cannot refrain from expressing my surprise, if it was your original intention to invite such an arrangement, that you should have waited until after I had made my appointments, inasmuch as we were both here in Chicago together for several days after my arrival, and again at Bloomington, Atlanta, Lincoln and Springfield, ; where it was well known I went for the purpose of consulting with the State Central Committee, and agreeing upon the plan of the campaign. While, under these circumstances, I do not feel at liberty to make any arrangements which would deprive the Democratic candidates for Congress, State officers, and the Legislature from participating in the discussion at the various meetings designated by the Democratic State Central Committee, I will, in order to accommodate you as far as it is in my power to do so, take the responsibility of making an arrangement with you for a discussion between us at one prominent point in each Congressional District in the State, except the second and sixth districts, where we have both spoken, and in each of which cases you had the concluding speech. If agreeable to you I will indicate the following places as those most suitable in the several Congressional Districts at which we should speak, to wit: Freeport,, Ottawa, Galesburg, Quincy, Alton, Jonesboro and Charleston. I will confer with you at the earliest convenient opportunity in regard to the mode of conducting the debate, the times of meeting at the several places, subject to the condition, that where appointments have already been made by the Democratic State Central Committee at any of those places, I must insist upon you meeting me at the times specified. Yours respectfully. Your most obedient servant, S. A. DOUGLAS. MK. LINCOLN ^0 MR. DOUGLAS. Springfield, July 29, 1858. Hon. S. A. Douglas Dear Sir; Yours of the 24th in relation to an arrangement to divide time, and address the same audiences, is received ; and, in apology for not sooner replying, allow me to say, that when I sat by you at dinner yesterday, I was not aware that you had answered my note, nor, certainly, that my own note had been presented to you. An hour after, I saw a copy of your answer in the Clipper and roared in indignation. I finished the original note, insinuations of attempted unfairness on my part are unjust, and with the hope that you will not very considerably make them, I proceed to reply To your statement that "It has been suggested, recently, that an arrangement had been made to bring out a third candidate for the U. S. Senate, who, with yourself, should canvass the State in opposition to me," &c., I can only say, that such suggestion must have been made by yourself, for certainly none such has been made by or to me, or otherwise, to my knowledge. Surely you did not deliberately conclude" as you insinuate, that I was expected to draw you into an arrangement, of terms ; to be agreed on by yourself, by which a third candidate and myself, "in concert, might be ; able to take the opening and closing speech in every case." As to your surprise that I did not sooner make the proposal to divide time with you, I can only say, I made it as soon as I resolved to make it. I did not know but that such proposal would come from you ; I waited, respectfully to see. It may have been well known to you

that you went to Springfield for the purpose of agreeing on the plan of campaign ; but it was not so known to me. When your appointments were announced in the papers, excluding only to the 21st of August, 1, for the first time, considered it certain that you would make no proposal to me, and then resolved that, if my friends concurred, I would make one to you." As soon thereafter as I could see and consult with friends satisfactorily, I did make the proposal. It did not occur to me that the proposed arrangement could derange your plans after the latest of your appointments already made. After that, there was, before the election, largely over two months of clear time. For you to say that we have already spoken at Chicago and "Springfield, and that on both occasions I had the concluding speech, is hardly a fair statement. The truth rather is this. At Chicago; July 9th, you made a carefully prepared conclusion on my speech of June 16th. Twenty-four hours after I made a hasty conclusion on yours of the 9th. You had six days to prepare, and concluded on Monday again at Bloomington on the 16th. Twenty-four hours after I concluded again on you at Springfield. In the meantime, you had made another conclusion on me at Springfield, which I did not hear, of the contents of which I knew nothing when I spoke; so that your speech made in daylight, and mine at night, of the 17th, at Springfield, were both made in perfect independence of each other. The dates of making all these speeches will show, I think; that in the matter of time for preparation, the advantage has all been on your side; and that none of the external circumstances have stood to my advantage. I agree to an arrangement for us to speak at the seven places you have named, and at your own times, provided you name the times at once, so that I, as well as you, can have to my self the time not covered by the arrangement. As to the other details, I wish perfect reciprocity, and no more. I wish as much time as you, and that conclusions shall alternate. That is all. Your obedient servant, A. Lincoln. P. S. As matters now stand, I shall be at no more of your exclusive meetings; and for about a week from today a letter from you will reach me at Springfield. A. L. MR. DOUGLAS TO MR. LINCOLN. ^ Bement, Piatt Co., Ill, July 30, 1858.: * Dear Sir; Your letter, dated yesterday, accepting my proposition for a joint discussion at: one prominent point in each Congressional District, as stated in my previous letter, was received this morning. The times and places designated, are as follows: Ottawa, LaSalle County.....August 21st, 1868. Freeport, Stephenson County,..... do 21th, do Jonesboro, Union County.....September 1st, do. Charleston, Coles County..... do 18th, do Galesburgh, Knox County.....October 7th, do ; Quincy, Adams County..... do 13th, do Alton, Madison County..... do 16th, do I agree to your suggestion that we shall alternately open and close the discussion. I will speak at Ottawa one hour, you can reply, occupying an hour and a half, and I will then follow for half an hour. At Freeport, you shall open the discussion and speak one hour, I will follow for an hour and a half, and you can then reply for half an hour. We will alternate in like manner in each successive place. Very respectfully, your obedient servant, S A. Douglas. Hon. A. Lincoln, Springfield, 111. MR. LINCOLN TO MR. DOUGLAS. ! Springfield, July

31, 1858. Hon. S. a. Douglas: i>a)- Sir: Your's of yesterday, naming places, times and terms,^for joint discussions betv^ecu u, wasrrecjv..... I ll

as you ioses, to arrange-oro, and this ap-Monday SCOLN.

BKg-iH ' oi o .t= i^ ?- * ough,' by th efour openin ie, and thus c this to you e both your 1 urnal and 11
Your obedien ':^ 03 o o =^ ^

<q 3 c3 t^ o 'aif^^ai' 2^~^s's o g >. S g g o s&.a a-SS-s 0'

yJ^^Mt^c. <L^ jt-^iAji<5 ,

i .

DOUGLAS' SPIiECH. Ladien and geittlfmen : I appear before you to- day tor the pu!f)Ose o! discussing the leadins; polit ioiil tui>ics wtiicli now agitate the public miud. By an aiTHnaement between At. Lincoln and mrself, we are iTresetit here today for the purpose of hav ing a joint diR.t jssion as the representatives of the two great political parties of the St at? and Union, upon the principles in issue between these parties and thiri vast ooncourse of people, shows the deep feelintj which pervade.- the public mind in regard to the questioiss diriding us. Prior lo 1854 this country was divided into two ereal political parties, known as the Whig and Democratic p.i ties. Both were national and patri- otic, advooatirjg principles that were universal iu their appliouion. An old line Whi^ could pro- claim bis principles iji Louisiana and Massachusetts alike. Whig principles iiad no boundary sectional lino, they were not limited by the Ohio river, nor by the Foioniac, nov bv the line ol ihe free and slave State, but .pjilied and were proolaivned wherever the Cons'itution ruled or the American flag waved orer the American soil. (-tlsap-Wm^Aod tlira&i:iiiecr.) ir^o it was, and so it is with the freat Deniocratie party, which, from the days ot efterijn until this periid, bus proven itself to be the historic piuty ot thU nation. While the Whig and Democratic purlios differed in regard to a bank, the tariff, distribution, ti.e specie circular and the sub treasury, they agreed on the great slavery ques tiou which now agitates the Union. 1 say that the Whig party and the Democratic party agreed on this sJaveiT question while they differed on those matters oi expediency to which 1 have referred. ' The Whig party and the Democratic party jointly adopted tise (ornproniise measures of 1850 as the basis of a proper and just solution of this slavery question in all its forms. Clay was the great leader, with Webster on his right ani: Cass on his left, and sustained t.iy the pati lots in tlie Whig and Demo- cratic ijtr.ks, wtio h.d devised and enacted the Com- promise raensures of 1860. in 1851, the Wing party and the Democratic par- ty united in Illinoiis in adopting resolutions endors- ing and approvingthe principles ot the compromise measures ot 1850, as the proper adjustment of that

question. In 1853, when the Whig party assembled in Convention at Baltimore for the purpose of nominating a candidate for the Presidency, the first thing it did was to declare the compromise measures of 1850, in substance and in principle, a suitable adjustment of this question. (The speaker was Sumner; and by Mr. Lincoln continued applause.) The silence will be more acceptable to me than the applause. I desire to address myself to your judgment, your consciences, and not to your passions. When the Democratic Convention assembled in Baltimore in the same year, for the purpose of nominating a Democratic candidate for the Presidency, it also adopted the compromise measures of 1850 as the basis of Democratic action. Thus you see that up to 1853-'54, the Whig party and the Democratic party both stood on the same platform with regard to the slavery question. That platform was the right of the people of each State and each Territory to decide their local and domestic institutions for themselves, subject only to the federal constitution. During the session of Congress of 1853-'54, I introduced into the Senate of the United States a bill to organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska on that principle which had been adopted in the compromise measures of 1850, approved by the Whig party and the Democratic party in Illinois in 1851, and endorsed by the Whig party and the Democratic party in national convention in 1852. In order that there might be no misunderstanding in relation to the principle involved in the Kansas and Nebraska bill, I put forth the true intent and meaning of the act in these words: "It is the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, or to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the federal constitution." Thus, you see, that up to 1854, when the Kansas and Nebraska bill was brought into Congress for the purpose of carrying out the principles which both parties had up to that time, endorsed and approved there had been no division in this country in regard to that principle except the opposition of the abolitionists. In the House of Representatives of the Illinois Legislature, upon a resolution asserting that principle, every Whig and every Democrat in the House voted in the affirmative, and only four men voted against it, and those four were old line Abolitionists. In 1854, Mr. Abraham Lincoln and Mr. Trumbull entered into an arrangement, one with the other, and each with his respective friends, to dissolve the old Whig party on the one hand, and to dissolve the old Democratic party on the other, and to connect the members of both into an Abolition party under the name and disguise of a Republican party. (Laughter and cheer for Douglas.) The terms of that arrangement between Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Trumbull have been published to the world by Mr. Lincoln's special friend, James H. Matheny, Esq., and they were that Lincoln should have Sumner's place in the U. S. Senate, which was then about to become vacant, and that Trumbull should give up my seat when my term expired. Great laughter Lincoln went to work to abolish the Old Whig party all over the State, pretending that he was then as good a Whig as ever; and Trumbull went to work in his part of the State preaching Abolitionism in its milder and lighter form, and trying, to abolish the

Democratic party, and bring old Democrats iindoupled and bound hand and foot into the Abolition camp. ("Good," "hurra for Douglas," ani cheers) In : uisuanoe of the arrangement, the parties met at Jipringtield m October, 1854, and proclaimed their new platform. Lincoln was to bring into the Abo- lition ca np the old line Whigs, and transfer them over to Giddings, Chase, Ford, Douglass and Parson Lovejoy, who were ready to receive them and christen them in their new faith, (faawgh4M!- ad ehaew) They laid down on that occasion a plat- form for their new Republican party, which was to be tons constructed. 1 h-ave the resolutions of their State convention then held, whichwas the first mass Siate Convention ever held in Illinoi by the iilnc-k Republican party, and I now holu tnem iu my lands mri will reau a pail ol them, and cause the others to be printed. Here is the most important and ma- terial resolution of this Abolition platform. 1. Resolved, That we believe this truth to be self-evident, that when iiartl^s become stibversive of the ends for which they Hie esta'^lish^d, O'- incapabfe of restoung the gover .- l^e^l to ibe true principles of the constitution, it is th riglit and duty of tbe people to uiasolve the political bAnds b. wliich itiey nitiy ha.'t-been connoted therewt b, and to or- ganize new parties upon such principles ami with such views as t'le circumstances and exigencies of the nation may de- mand. 2. Besolved. 'f hat the limes imperatively demand theie- organizaaiion of parties, and repudiatins all p evious party at'ECbments, names and predilections, we ui.ite ourstlvcs togettier in d-fence of the liberty and constiuiiion t-f itie country, and will hereafter co- opli ate as the Republican par- t', pledg'd to the accorapl:sbm3nt of lhefoilowian purposes: to bring the administration of the government ba, ktotlie control of first principles; to restore Nebraska and Kansas to the position of free territories; tha', as lb- consti;ution of the United states, vests in the States, and not in Oongre^a, the power to les'-la'fc f r tlie extradition of fog ti.es trora labor, to repeal and entirely ahrogaie tt,e fugitive slave law; to restrict slavery to toose Sta es in which it ex sts; topro- hit^it the admi-s:ion of any more slav;; States into tbe Union; to abo ish slaver> in the District of Columbia; to exclude slavery from all tlie tei ritorles overwhloh the ge,eril gpv- ernm-.nt has exlosive jurisdiction; and to resist the acqiure- miiitaof any moie territories unless the practice of slavery therein lorever sba 1 have been prohibited. 3. Resolved, That in tuitherar^ce of these principles we will use such conatitutional and lawful means as'shall si-em bfst adapted'o their ace aiplistiment, and that we will sup- port no man for onxe. under the general or State govern- ment, who is not positively ard full, t:ommitted to tbe sup port of these principles, and whose personal character and conduct is not a guaranty that he is reliable, and who shah n t have abjured old party allegiance and ties. ('the resolutions, as tha^jvere read, were "eheered ?hrou'^out,)' '^ Now, geotlejnen, your Black itepublioans have cheered every one of those propositions, ("good-d fewsrs^-'^^ and yet I venture to say that you- cannot get Mr. Lincoln to come out and say that he is now,- in favor of each one of them. (Laughter and, api platise. "Hi4-_bini again,-"; That these projiosi- iions, one and ail,constitute tbe platform otthe Black Repui>lican party of this day,1 havenodoubt,eg9d') and when you were not aware for what purpose I was reading them, .your Black Republicans cheered them as good Black Republican doctrines. C^XUat^s ^it," etc.) My object in reading these resolutions, was to put

the question to Abraham Lincoln this day, whether he now stands and will stand by each article in that creed/ and carry it out. t**"G****^-" "-Hit him,again'.y I desire to know whether Mr. Lincoln to- uay stands as he did in 1854, in favor of the unconditional 'j-epeal of the fugitive slave law. I desire him to answer whether h stands pledged to-day, as be did in 1854, against the admission of any more slave States into the Union, even if the people want them. fi want to know whether he stands pledged against the admission of a new State into the tjuion with such a constitution as thepeople of that State may see tit to make. (t^That'ait-;" "putit athim,") if want to know whether he stands to- day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. (>I desire him to^answer whether ha stands pledged to the prohibition of the slave trade between the different States. ("He does.") 1 desire to know whether he stands pledged to prohibit slavery in all the territories 01 the United States, North as well as South of the Missouri Compromise line, ,^^K"au8as too.") 1 desire him to answer whether he is opposed to the acquisition of ,iny more terri- tory unless slavery is first prohibited iherein, 1 - want bis answer to these questions. Vour ailinna five cheers in favor of this Abolition platform is not satisfactory. 1 ask Abraham Lincoln to answer these questions, in order that when 1 trot him down to lower Egypt 1 may put the same questions to nim, (^Ealirasiastio- applause,) .My principles are the same everywhere, -(beers, and "hark.") 1 can proclaim them alike in the North, tbe South, the East, and the West. My principles will fpply wherever the Constitution prevails and the American flag waves. (W-floetf;"^ and applause,) 1 desire to know whether Mr. Lin- coln's principles *ill bear transplanting from Otta wa to Jonesboro? I put these questions to him to- day distinctly, and ask an answer. I have a rig'nt to an answer (-"that's so," "he -ean'rtoKtge-vflu," etc), for i quote frdfil the plat- form of the Republican party, made by himself and others at the time that party was formed, and the bargain made by Lincoln to dissolve and kill the bld'Whigpartyjand transfer its members, bound hand and toot, to the Abolition party, under the di- rection of Giddmgs and Fred Douglass. (Cheets.) In the remarks I have made on this platform, and the position of Mr, Lincoln upon it, 1 mean nothing personally di.srespeclful or unkind to that gentle- man. I have known him for nearly twenty-five ysars. There were many points of sympathy be- tween ns when we first got acquainted. We were both comparatively boys, and both struggling with povertv in a grange land. I was a school-teacher in the town of Winchester, and he a fl..uri3hing grocery-keeper in tlje town of Salem, (ApphirtSBTmd ittughtur.) He was more successful in his oc cupation than I was in mine, and hence more fortunate in this world's goods. Lincoln IS one of tfjose peculiar men who per- form with admirable skill everything which they undertake. 1 made as good a sciiool-teacher as I could and when a cabinet maker I made a good bedstead and tables, although my old boss said I succeeded better with bureaus and secretaries than anything else ; -toieeCTS,^ but I believe that Lincoln was always more successful in business than I, for his business enabled him to get into the Legislature. I 'met him there, however, and had a sympathy with him, because ot the up hill struggle we both had in lite. He was then just as good at teh^ ing an anecdote as now, (-is-NtrdBbl.-2) He could beat any of the boys wrestling, or running a toot race, in pitching quoits or tossing a copper, could ruin more

liquor than all the boys of the town together, {apTear.iOi-Vaugliterj3 and the dignity and impartiality with which he presided at a horse race or fist fight, excited the admiration and won the praise of everybody that was present and participated. (E<<red lauirbter,-) I sympathised with him, because he was struggling with difficulties and so was I. Mr. Lincoln served with me in the Legislature in 1836, when we both retired, and he subsided or became submerged, and he was lost sight of as a public man for some years. In 1846, when Wilmot introduced his celebrated proviso, and the Abolition tornado swept over the country, Lincoln again turned up as a member of Congress from the Sangamon district. I was then in the Senate of the United States, and was #.

r.> Ti-tfVtftfi I n I t 1 !? I

I

My friend and companion. When in Congress, he distinguished himself by his opposition to the Mexican war, taking the side "of the common enemy against his own country ; (-U-ttMrtVt***,") and when he returned home he found that the indignation of the people followed him everywhere, and he was again submerged or obliged to retire into private life, "forgotten by his former friends. ('Aod.witl bo again.") He came up again in 1854; just in time to make this Abolition or Black Republican platform, in company with Giddings, Lovjoy, Chase, and Fred Douglass for the Republican party to stand upon. (J-*u4^iier, "4iit-^at *igaiiiy"-&c.) Trumbull, too, was one of our own contemporaries. He was born and raised in old Connecticut, was bred a federalist, but removing to Georgia, turned Unionist when nullification was popular, and as soon as he disposed of his clocks and wound up his business, migrated to Illinois, ^tltgrtftf^ turned politician and lawyer here, and made his appearance in 1841, as a member of the Legislature. He became noted as the author of the scheme to repudiate a large portion of the State debt of Illinois, which, if successful, would have brought infamy and disgrace upon the fair escutcheon of our glorious State. The odium attached to that measure consigned him to oblivion for a time, I helped to do it. I walked into a public meeting in the hall of the House of Representatives and replied to his repudiating speeches, and resolutions were carried over his head 'denouncing repudiation, and asserting the moral and legal obligation of Illinois to pay every dollar of the debt she owed and every bond that bore her seal. (**G'Od,"-.ABA-beyft5^ TrumbuU's malignity has followed me since I thus defeated his 'infamous scheme. ^^These two men having formed this combination to abolitionize the old Whig party and the old Democratic party, and put themselves into the Senate of the United States, in pursuance of their bargain, are now carrying out that arrangement, Matheny states that Trumbull broke faith; that the bargain was that Lincoln should be the Senator in Shields' place, and Trumbull was to wait for mine; 4laBijilJ*:aud, ebeestv) and the story goes, that Trumbull cheated Lincoln, having control of four or five abolitionized Democrats who were holding over in the Senate ; he would not let them

vote for Lincoln, and which obliged the rest of the Abolitionists to support him in order to secure an Abolition Senator. There are a number of authorities for the truth of this beside Matheny, and I suppose that even Mr. Lincoln will not deny it. Mr. Lincoln demands that he shall have the place intended for Trumbull, as Trumbull cheated him and got his, and Trumbull is stumping the State translating me for the purpose of securing that position for Lincoln, in order to quiet him. It was a consequence of this arrangement that the Republican Convention was empanelled to instruct for Lincoln and nobody else, and it was on this account that they passed resolutions that he was their first, their last, and their only choice. Archy Williams was nowhere, Browning was nobody, Wentworth was not to be considered, they had no man in the Republican party for the place except Lincoln, for the reason that he demanded that they should carry out the arrangement. Having formed this new party for the benefit of deserters from Whiggery, and deserters from Democracy, and having laid down the Abolition platform which I have read, Lincoln now takes his stand and proclaims his Abolition doctrines. Let me read apart of them. In his speech at Springfield to the convention which nominated him for the Senate, he said: // In my opinion it will not cease until a crisis shall have 'been reached and passed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half Slave and half Free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved I do not expect the house to fall but I do expect it will cease to be divided, it will be all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents will arrest the farther spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction: or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful if all the States old as well as new, North as well as South, say "good." I am delighted to hear you Black Republicans say "good." I have no doubt that that doctrine expresses your sentiments and I will prove to you now, if you will listen to me, that it is revolutionary and destructive of the existence of this Government. Mr. Lincoln, in the extract from which I have read, says that this Government cannot endure permanently in the same condition in which it was made by its framers divided into free and slave States. He says that it has existed for about seventy years thus divided, and yet he tells you that it cannot endure permanently on the same principles and in the same relative condition in which our fathers made it. Why can it not exist divided into free and slave States? Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, Jay, and the great men of that day, made this Government divided into free States and slave States, and left each State perfectly free to do as it pleased on the subject of slavery. Why can it not exist on the same principles on which our fathers made it? They knew when they framed the Constitution that in a country as wide and broad as this, with such a variety of climate, production and interest, the people necessarily required different laws and institutions in different localities. They knew that the laws and regulations which would suit the climate of New Hampshire would be unsuited

to the rice plantations of South Carolina, (eight-UiifiH',") and they, therefore, provided that each State should retain its own Legislature, and its O'.vn sovereignty with the full and complete power to do as it pleased \\\ithin its own limits, in all ihat was local aud not national, (.applaiiw.) One of the reserved rights ot the States, was the ria;ht to regulate the relations between Master and Servant, on th slavery question. At the time the t onstitution was formed, there were thirleen States in the Union, twelve of which were slaveholding States and l'ne a free State. Suppose this doctrine of uniformity preached by Mr. Lincoln, that the States should all be free or all be slave had prevail- ed and what would have been the result? Of course, the twelve slaveholding States would have overruled the one free Slate, and slavery would have been fastened by a Constitutional provision on every inch of the American Rtpublic, instead of being left as our t -^ cide for itsen. t l'^.uo. s. J^^ ,;- r''*-''-'A (or Douglas.) Here! assert that uniformity in the local laws and instiluiious of the different States is neither possible or desirable, il uniformity had been adopted when the government w s ostablisii- ed it must inevitably have been the uniformity ot slavery everywhere, or else the uniformity ot negro.- citizenship and negro equality everywhere. We are told by Lincoln that he is utt rly opposed to the Ured Scott decision, and will not submit to it lor the reason that he says it deprives th:- ne- gro of the rights and privileges of citizenship.-- (bim;hr aod applaasfc) That is the hist and kain reason which he assi;;ns tor h.s wai fare on the Supreme Court of the United States and its deci- sion. I ask you, are you in favor of conferrmg upou'the negro the rii..fi'--^ .nid privileges ot citizen- ship? ("Jii!.J^ Uo you desire to strike out of our State Constitution that clause which keeps slaves and bee negroes out of the State and allow the fre.- negroes to flow in, (AUwerv') and cover vou.-prairies with black settlements? Do you de- sire to turn this beautilul State into a free, negro colony, Ksa^JM^m order that when Missouri abolishes slavery she can send one hundred tlio- sand emancipated slaves into Illinois, to become citizens and voters, on an equality with yourselves! MJ^ev^f'-M^oJ^A) U you desire negro citizenship, if you d'sire to allow them to come into the State and settle with the white man, if yi'U desire them to vote on an equality with yourselves, an.l to make them eligible to office, to serve on juries, and to adjudge your rights, then support Mr. Lincoln and the Black Republican party who are in favor of the citizenship ot the negro. f'Si^vr^JMwrf) lor one I am opposed to n(-o-io citizenship in any and every form. -f^beej*^ 1 believe this government was made on the white basis, t-eTW*) 1 believe it was made by white men, for the^ beneht of white men and their posterity for ever, and I am in favor of confining citizenship to white men, men of Eu- ropean birth and descent, instead of conferring it upon negroes, Indians and other inferior races. (t'-Xieod-for you." " Douglas forever.") Mr. Lincoln, following the example and lead of all the little Abolition orators, who go around and lecture in the basements of schools and churches, reads from the Declaration of Independence, that all men were created equal, aud then asks how can you deprive a negro ot that equality which God aud the Declaration of Independence awards to him. He and they maintain that negro equiitiy is guar- antied bv the laws of God, and that it is asserted' in the Declaration of Independence. If they think so, of course they have a right to say so, and so vote. 1 do not questions Mr, Lincoln's conscien-

tious belief fiat the negro was made his equal, and hence is his brother, -^temt*tef) but for my own part, I do not regard the negro as my equal, ami positively deny that he is my brother or any kin to me whatever.-^'Nwvef';-" - "Hit hiiB again;" ami ,cheer!?.")- Lincoln has evidently learned by heart Parson Lovejoy's catechism. (JUasglrter iwl-,ap- plHUe,-) He can repeat it as well as Farnsworth, and he is worthy of a medal from father Giddings and Fred Douglass for his Abolitionism, .(iemghter.) He holds that the negro was born his equal and yours, and that he was endowed with equality by the Almighty, and that no human law can deprive him of these rights which were guarantied to him by the Supreme ru- ler of the Universe. Now, I do not believe that the Almighty ever intended the negro to be the equal of the white man. „('(^ Never, never.") If he did, he has been a long time demonstrating the fact. (Uheersk-) For thousands of years the negro has been a'riice upon the earth, and during alljthat time, in all latitudes an i climates, wherever he has wan- dered or been taken, he has been inferior to the race which he has there met. He belongs to an in- ferior race, and must always occupy an inferior po sition. (HGood," "that's so," &o,) I do not hold that because the negro is our inferior that therefore he ought to be a slave. By no means can such a conclusion be drawn from what I have said. On the contrary, I hold that humanity and Christianity both require that the negro shall have and enjoy eve-y right, every privilege, and every immunity consistent with the safety of the society in which he lives. (Shiftti'nno) On that point, I presume, there can be no diversity of opinion, xou and I are bound to extend to our inferior and dependent be- ing every right, every privilege, every facility and immunity consistent" with the public good. The question then arises what rights and privileges are consistent with the public good. This is a question which each State and each Territory must decide for itself Illinois has decided it for herself We have provided that the negro shall not be a slave, and we have also provided that he shall not be a citizen, but protect him in his civil rights, in his lite, his person and his property, only depriving him of a^, political rights whatsoever, and refusing to put him on an equality with the white man. (*^mid:"^ That policy of Illinois is satisfactory to the Democratic party and to me, and if it were to the Republi cans, there would then be no question upon the subject; but the Republicans say that he ought to be made a citizen, aud when he becomes a citizen he becomes your equal, with all your rights and privileges. (-HiniefS?~Tm!tT^ They assert the Dred Scott decision to be monstrous because it denies that the negro is or can be a citizen under the Constitution. Now, I hola bat Illinois had a right to abolish and prohibit slavery as she did, and I hold that Kentucky has the same right to continue and protect slavery that Illinois had to abolish it. I hold that New Ifork had as much right to abolish slavery as Virginia has to continue it, and that each and everv" State of this Union is a sovereign power, with the right to do as it pleases upon this question of slavery, and upon all its domestic institutions. Slavery is not the only ques- tion which comes up in this controvei sy. There is a far more important one to yon, and that is, what shall be done with the free negro ? We have set- tled the slavery question as far as we ar<! concern- ed; we have prohibited it in Illinois forever, and in doing so, I think we have done wisely, and there is no man in the State who would be more strenuous in his opposition to the

introduction of slavery than I would ; (ia-but when we : ettle it for ourselves, we exhausted all our power over that subject. We have done our whole duty, and can .do no more. We must leave each and every other State to decide for itself the same question. In relation to the policy to be pursued I I

^dr^am^J.: -^ \ 'h

%' } \ > ,.v'!U'd.~ li.c ir.,-negroes, we !mv!> .->!d that they shall not vole ; whilst Mtiaae, on the other hand, has said that they shall vote. Mi.l-.E ia a sovereign State, and has the power to regulate the qualifica- tions of voters within her limits. 1 would never consent to confer the right of voting and of citizen- ship upon a negro, hut still 1 a.n:i not going to quar- rel with Maine ior differing from rue in opinion. Let Maine take care of her own negroes and fix. the qualifications of her own voters to suit herself, without interfering with Illinois, and Illinois will not interfere with Maine. So with the State fo New York. She allows the negro to vote provided he owns two hundred and fifty dollars' worth of property, but not otherwise. While I would not make any distinction whatever between a negro who held property and one who did notj yet if the sovereign State of Vew York chooses to make that distinction it is her business and not mine, and 1 will not quarrel with her for it. She can do as she pleases on this ques- tion if she minds her own business, and we will do the same thing. Now, my friends if we will only act conscientiously and ragidly upon this great principle of popular si vereignty which guarantees to each State and Territory the right to do as it pleases on all things local and domestic instead of Con'^ress ioterferring, we will continue at peace one with another. Why should Illinois be at war with Missouri, or Kentucky with Ohio, or Virginia with New York, merely because their institutions differ. Oitr fathers intended that our institutions should diiTer. They knew that the North and the South having different climates, productions and interests, required different institutions. This doc- trine of Mr. Lincoln's ot uniformity among the in- stitutions of the different States is a new doctrine, never dreamed of by Washington, Madison, or the * framers of this Government. Mr. Lincoln and the Republican party set themselves up as wiser than these men who made this government, which has flourished for seventy years under the principle of popular sovereignty, recognizing the right of each State to do as it pleased. Under that principle, we have grown from a nation of three or four millions to a nation of about thirty millions of people ; we have crossed the Allegheny mountains and filled up the whole North West, turning the prairie into a garden, and building up churcEeg ana schools, thus spreading civilization and Christianity where before there was nothing but savage-barbarism. Under that principle we have become from a feeble natioii, the most powerful on the face of the earth, and if we only adhere to that principle, we can go forward increasing in territory, in power, in strength and in glory until the Eepublic of America shall be the North Star t'^at shall guide the friendsof freedom throughout tiie civilized wwld.

iiiJa@g-ma.y you live," and great applause.') And why can we not adhere to the great principle of self-government, upon which our institutions were originally based. (WJBie-"emi:") 1 believe that this new doctrine preached by Mr. Lincoln and his party will dissolve the Union if it succeeds. They are trying to array all the Northern States in one body against the South, to excite a sectional war between the free States and the slave States in order that the one or the other may be driven to the wall, I am told that my time is out. Mr. Lincoln will now address you for an hour and a half, and I will then occupy an half hour in replying to him. ^f^ree ttmcB three eher-is--~we*^~lrere'-giyeQ f^r- Mr. Lincoln's Reply. Mr. Lincoln then came forward and v; a3g1 | eet- ed with loud atni" ..p, rotracted cheers from fAUy two-thirds of the audience. This was admitted by the Douglas men on the platform. It was some minutes before he could make himself heard, even by those on the stand. At last; he said; My Fellow-Citizens : When a man hears himself somewhat misrepresented, it provokes him - at least, I find it so with myself; but when the misrepresentation becomes very gross and palpable, it is more apt to amuse him. 4***^***' .:l6f,4 The first thing I see fit to notice, is the, fact that Judge Douglas alleges, after running through the history of the old Democratic and the old Whig parties, that Judge Trumhull and myself made an arrangement in 1854, by which I was to have the place of Gen. Shields in the United States Senate, and Judge TrumbuU was to have the place of Judge Douglas. Now all I have to say upon that subject is, that I think no man -not even Judge Douglas can prove it, because his story is not true. fCfeersif I have no doubt, he is " conscientious " in saying it. ^*iswgbtF?> As to those resolutions that he took such a length of time to read, as being the platform of the Republican party in 1854,*; I say I never had anything to do with them, and I think TrumbuU never had. ""TitiWf" ^ iingKtai%. Judge Douglas cannot show that either one of us ever did have anything to do with them. I believe this is true about those resolutions: There was a call for a Convention to form a Republican party at Springfield, and I think that my friend Mr. Lovejoy, who is here upon this stand, had a hand in it. I think this is true, and I think if he will remember accurately, he will be able to collect that he tried to get me into it, and I would ^ not go in. tUiifie**~and iaogtitCT. I believe it is also true, that I went away from Springfield when the Convention was in session, to attend court in Tazewell County. It is true they did place my name, though without authority, upon the Committee, and afterwards wrote me to attend the meeting of the Committee,)>ut I refused to do so, and I never had anything to do with that organization. This is the plain truth about all that matter of the resolutions. Now, about this story that Judge Douglas tells of TrumbuU bargaining to sell out the old Democratic party, and Lincoln agreeing to sell out the old Whig party, I have the means of knowing about that; I might Judge Douglas cannot have ; and I know there is no substance to it whatever. fApphmsc-'J Yet I have no doubt he is " comseieK<Jeus" about it. ffe^hteF. I know that after Mr. Lovejoy got into the Legislature that winter, he complained of me that I had told all the old Whigs in his district that the old Whig party was . them voted in it. I know that after Mr. Lovejoy got into the Legislature that winter, he complained of me that I had told all the old Whigs in his district that the old Whig party was . them voted in it. Now I have no means of totally disproving such charges as this which the Judge makes. A man cannot prove a negative, but he has a right to claim that when a man makes an affirmative charge, he must offer some proof to show

the truth of what he says. I certainly cannot introduce testimony to show the negative about things, but I have a right to claim that if a man says be knows a thing, then he must show how he knows it. I always have a right to claim this, and it is not satisfactory to me that he may be "conscientious" on the subject. (4>hers-aBd Now gentlemen, I hate to waste my time on such things, but in regard to that general abolition tilt that Judge Douglas makes, when he says that I was engaged at that time in selling out and abolitifcizing the old Whig party I hope you will permit me to read a part of a printed speech that I made then at Peoria, which will show altogether a different view of the position I look in that contest of 1864. Voice ^Put on your specs. Mr. Lincoln Yes sir, I am obliged to do so. "I am no longer a young man. Please tell me * ^I'll be it is true; Taissonri Coinpromise. The history may not be precisely accurate in every particular; but I am sure it is sufficiently so, for all the uses I shall attempt to make of it, and in it, we have before us, the chief matter enabling us to correctly judge whether the repeal of the Missouri (Compromise is right or wrong. I think, and shall try to show, that it is wrong; wrong in its direct effect, letting slavery into Nebraska; and wrong in its prospective principle, allowing it to spread to every other part of the wide world, where we can be inclined to take it. // This is a clear indication, but as I must think, a great zeal for the spread of slavery, I can not but hate. I hate it because of the notorious injustice of slavery itself. I hate it because it deprives our republican example of its just influence in the world; enables the enemies of free institutions, with plausibility, to taunt us as hypocrites; causes the rival friends of freedom to doubt our sincerity; and especially because so many really good men amongst ourselves in, to an open war with the very fundamental principles of civil liberty, criticizing the Declaration of Independence, and insisting that there is no right principle of action but self-interest. // Before proceeding, let me say I think I have no prejudice against the Southern people. They are just what we would be in their situation. I have no wish to extend the same amongst us, but they would not introduce it. If it did now exist amongst us, we should not instantly give it up. I believe of the masses north and south. Doubtless there are individuals, on both sides, who would not hold slaves under any circumstances; and others who would gladly introduce slavery anew, if it were out of existence. We know that some Southern men do free their slaves, go north, and become tip-top abolitionists; while some Northern men go south, and become most cruel slaveholders. ^When Southern people tell us they are no more responsible for the origin of slavery, than we; I understand the fact. ^When it is said that the institution exists, and that it is very difficult to get rid of it, in any satisfactory way, I can understand and appreciate the saving. I surely will not blame them for not doing what I should not know how to do myself. If all earthly powers were given me, I should not know what to do. As to the existing institution, my first impulse would be to free all the slaves, and send them to Liberia, to their own native land. But a moment's reflection would convince me, that whatever of high hope, (as I think there is) there may be in this, in the long run, its sudden execution is impossible. If they were all landed there 'in a day', they would all perish in the next ten days; and there are not surplus ships and sufficient money in the

world to carry them therein many tinnis ten days. 'What then? Free them all, and keep tlicm among us as underlings'. 'Is it quite certain that this bett-ers their condi- tion'. 'I think I would not hold one in slavery, at any rate ; yet the point is not clear eiwugli , to me to denounce peojile upon. "WTiaf next'. 'Free thi'in, and make them politically and so- cially, ouri^qual,-;'. 'My own l'eelings will not ad- mit of this; and il'min would, we well know that those of tlie great ma.ss of while pcoi)'c will not, Whether this feeling accords witli justice and Sound judgment, is not the solo question, if in- deed, it is any part ot it. A universal feeling, whether well or iil-l'Dunded, can not bo salcly disregarded. "We can not, then, make theui e- Uqifals. It does seem to mo that systems of gradual emancipation might be udojiled ; but for their lardine.s iu tiiis, I will not undertake to judge our brethren of the south. ff When they remind us of fheir constitutional rights, i ackiu)wli'dge them, not grudgingly, bul fully, and f.iirly ; and I would give them any le- gislation lor tiee reclaiming of their lugitivcs, which should not, iu its stringency, be more likeiyjtocairi'y a free man into slavery, than our ordinaiy criminal laws ai'c lo hang an innocent # ^V) 4 n&i^^^' ' ^_7V

M^

y^ \x / ^ lint all this; 1o my ji-.d^jnifint, funiL-lips no fiuiiv excuse l'In- peniiltiu;^/- sUnvry to go into oui- own iVee tvriitDiy, lliuii it woiijj lbi' reviv- in,;^t'le AlVieansUvc ti-adu by law. 'J'lic law vviich lorbids ihe bviB>;iuf^ of ahivi-s frnm Alri- ea; and tliat which has so lonu; forliid the tak- ing them to -S'ebi'a.-ka, can hai-djy bedisiinijuish- cd on any moral iji-iaaple ; aid the repeal of the former eonid lind quite as jdausibie eicuses as that of the latter.// I have reason to kaoiv that Jud?e Douglas ltnows that I aaid this. I thiuk he has the answer here to oae of the questions he put to me. I ao not mean to allow him to catechise me unless he pays back tor it in kind. I will not answer ques- tions one after ano her unless he reciprocates, but as he made this inquiry and I have answered It be- tore, lie has ptot it withou. my getting auythiug in return. Ec has got ray nn'-wer ob the Fugitive Slave Law. *>*- Now fentlemen,! don't want to read at any: greaterleugth, but tills is the true complexion of ull I have ever said in regard to the institution of slavery and the black race. This ia tiee whole of it, and anything that argues me into his idea of perfect social and poliicid equality whhtlie negro, is but a specious and fantastic arrangement of words, by which a man can prove a horse chestnut to be a chestnut horse. fcuwfliti'H I will say here, while upon this s*jectj tiat I nave no pur- pose directly oi: indirectly to in(,erlere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no iuciination to do so. I have no purpose to introduce political and social equalitv between the white and the black races. T'hsre is a physical differ- ence between the two, which in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality, and inas- much as it becomes a necessity that there mast be a difference. I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to v/hicb I belong, hay:- iag the superior position. I

have never said cnytbing to the contrary, but I hold that not- withstanding ail this, there is uo reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, -ffanr*-chews.4- 'I ^old that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas he is not my : equaliumany respeols-certairdy ijpt itLCOLOR, perhaps not in moral or intellectual fendowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his owa hand earns, /iS is m.y ignal and the equal erf Jmige Douglas^ and t ie equal of fvery living mar?/ ^iaMf{>^*\i,' KJw 1 pass ba tti caasider one or tv.o more o.', i'lese little foliies. ^he Jut'geis woftiUy fci, ! ;*uit about Cis itariy frleEiii Liscdiii being a *'grocery keeper." Inn^jJrtM.I I don't iyioW a; it .ronld be a f""-ii-t sin, if I had been, but 'ae j*mi9tcken.-; Lu:^\):' ueve? kept a grocery ^;/- j *%r.j ia tiie wotla. LirriiViiiir. ;i.ij tri - , that Lincoln did work the latter part of one wia- ter in a little still hoafie, tap at the head of *hol- KiW. Bioiof liiugtrter, And so 1 think my friend, the~Ju'dg97"a"equally. at fijult when he c'larges me at the time when I was m Congress of having opposed our soldiers who were fighting in the Mexican war. The Judge did not make his charge very distinctly but I can tell you what he can prove by referring to the record. Vou remember I was an old Whig, and when- ever the Democratic party tried to get me to vote that the War had ueen righteously begun by the President, I would not doit. But whenever they asked for any money, or land warrants, or ar.ything to pay the soldiers there, during all tiat time, I-gave the same votes that Judge Douglas did. t.nnd Bpplnnse. You can think as you please as to whether that was consistent. Such is the truth; and the Judge has the right to make all he can ut of it. But wheu he, fiy a general charge, conveys th idea that I withheld supplies from i'm soldiers who were fightini; in the Mexican war, or did anything else to hinder the soldiers, he is, to say the least, grossly and altogether mistakeil, as a consultation of the records will prove to him. As I have not used up so much of my time as I had supposed, I will dwell a_little longer upon one or two of these m.iuor topics tipon v/hioh the Judge has spoken. He has reud from my. speech iQ Springfield, m which I say that "a house divid- ed agai s. itself Cimnot stand." Dies the Judge say it can stand? LaugQter. I don't know whether he be does or not. The Judge does not seem to be attending to me just now, uut I would like to know if it is his opinion that a house divided against itself can stand. If he does, then there is a question of veracity, not between him und me, but between the Judge and aU authority of a somewhat higher character. Laughior ai-d applnuuo. Now, my friends, I ask your attention to this matter for the purpose of saying something se- riously. I know that the. judge may readily eaough agre& with iiiiie that the maxim which was put forth by the Saviour is true, but he may allege that I misapply it; and the Judge has a tight to urge that, in my application, i do mis- apply it, and then I have a right to show that I do not misapply it. When he undertakes to say that because I think this nation, so tar .as the question of Slavery is concerned, will all become one thing or all the other, 1 am in favor of bringing about a dead uniformity in the various States, in all their institutions, he argues erroneously. The great variety of the local institutions in the States, springing from differences in the soil, differences in the face of the country, and in the climate, are bonds

of Union. They do not make "a house divided against itself," but they make a house united, if the introduction in our country of what is called by the "wants" of another nation is not a matter of discord but a bond of union! true bonds of union. But can this question of slavery be considered as among various varieties in the institutions of the country? I leave it to you to say whether, in the history of our government, this institution of slavery has not always failed to be a bond of union, and has rather been an apple of discord and an element of division in the house. Guopri'm ><M,nBd uppla,. | I ask you to consider whether, so long as the moral constitution of men's minds shall continue to be the same, after this generation and assemblage shall sink into the grave, and another race shall arise with the same moral and intellectual development we have—whether, if that institution is the same irritating position in which it now is, it will not continue an element of division? If so, then I have a right to say that in regard to this question, the Union is a house divided against itself, and when the Judge reminds me that I have often said to him that the institution of slavery has existed for eighty years in some States, and yet it does not exist in some others. I agree to the fact, and I account for it by looking at the position in which our fathers originally placed it—restricting it from the new Territories where it had not gone, and legislating to cut off its source by the abolition of the slave trade, thus putting the seal of legislation against its spread. The public mind did rest in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. But lately, I think and in this I charge nothing on the Judge's motives—lately, I think, that he, and those acting with him, have placed that institution on a new basis, which looks to its perpetuity and nationalization of slavery. And while it is placed upon this new basis, I say, and I have said, that I believe we shall not have peace upon the question until the opponents of slavery arrest the further advance of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or, on the other hand, that its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new. North as well as South. Now, I believe if we could arrest the spread, and place it where Washington, and Jefferson, and Madison placed it, it would be in the course of ultimate extinction, and the public mind would, as for eighty years past, believe that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. The crisis would be past and the institution might be let alone for a hundred years, if it should live so long, in the States where it exists, yet it would be going out of existence in the way best for both the black and the white races. Great cheering. A Voice Then do you repudiate Popular Sovereignty? Mr. Lincoln Well, then, let us talk about Popular Sovereignty! - Laughter. J- What is Popular Sovereignty? Or is it of the people? Is it the right of the people to have slavery or not have it, as they see fit, in the territories? I will state and I have an abundance to watch me my understanding is that Popular Sovereignty, as now applied to the question of Slavery, does allow the people of a Territory to have Slavery if they want to, but does not allow them not to have it if they do not want it. In the use of the word. I do not mean that in this vast concourse of people where in a Territory of the United States, any one of them would be

obliged to have a slave if he did not want one ; but I do say that, as I understand the Dred Scott decision, if any one man wants s^alaves, all the rest have no way of keeping that one man from holding them. Wuen I made my speech at Springfield, of which the Judge complains, and from which he quotes, I really was not thinking of the things which he ascribes to me at all. I had no thought in the world that I was doing anything to bring about a war between the free and si ive States. I had no thought in the world that I was doing anything to bring about a political and social equality of the black and white races. It never occurred to me that I was doing anything or fa- voring anything to reduce to a dead uniformity all the local institutions of the various States" But I must say, in all fairness to him, if he thinks I am doing something which leads to these bad results, It IS none the better that I did not mean it. It is jast as fatal to the country, if I have any infiuence in producing it, whether I intend it or not But can it be true, that placing this institution upon the original basis the basis upon which our fathers placed it can have any tendency to set the Northern and the Southern States at war with one another, or that it can have any tendency to make the people of Ver- mont raise sugar cane, because they raise it in Louisiana, or that it can compel the people of Illinois to cut nine.logs on the Grand Prairie, where they will not grow, because they cut pine logs in Mains, where they do grow, f Laughter, The Judge says this is a new principle started in regard to this question. JDoes the Judge claim that he is working on the plan of the founders of government? I think he says in some of his speeches indeed I have one here now that he saw evidence of a policy to allow slavery to be south of a certain line, while north of it it should be excluded, and he saw an indisposition on the part of the country to stand upon that policy,^ and t'aerefore he set about studying the subject upon original prin- ciples and upon original principles he got up the Nebraska- bill! I am lighting it upon these "original principles" fighting it in the Jeffer- sonian, Washingtonian, and Madisonian fashion, twiightpr nnd nppfaim!r) Now my friends I wish you to attend for a lit- tle while to one or two other things in that Springfield speech. My main object was to show, so far as my humble ability was capable of showing to the people of this country, what I believed was the truth-that there was a tendency, if not a conspiracy among those who have engineered this slavery question for the last four or five vears, to make slauery perpetual , - .w ll w

I ll I ^i,

Mi%i^ and universal in'this nation. Having made that speech principally for that object, after arrang- ifl2 the evidences that I thoaght tended to prove my proposition, I concluded with this bit of comment: "W c3rm"t absolutely know hatth'senaot adap'a- tioDsa'-ettie resaltof ore-concert, but when we sM a lot of framed limbers, US rent portloos of which we know huve beea a-i-ten out at dlffeienttimea and places, and by diffS-ent w Tkmen-Stephen, FrankHn, Rugr and James, for instance-.nd when we see these timber Molned IO- gether, and see they exactly makethetram*

of a house or mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting and all the lengths and proportions of the different plows exactly 1 Adapted to their respective plows and LOt a piece. tm. ' phe- ml Fi m i>a f ^ "n^ airtforked ppon a one c 'iiVi 1 ijietlwrtst Wow was Lommo ^-j^^^ ^ 3^ 0 t; ;o/; ^KM-^^ ^;S"oU\ne .i:z 'At ^j^:^^^, rcaait and 'A!e he p.i no attention >ofMs -!! bHtcomphmente me as being a ,,, ^n^int^flUent gentleman," had c X t !*3 h8 oes <m and 4 ou^ 'rjm nay speeci tins <o .et the bteat at war with V, uuke all the institutions uni- 1 th-jniggeis and white psopls to Tn'-dllb.c^Xl. ^^T^mvteKBTv I wi^ imlt. taken -W-TjgMerj ">^ ctxe t om ? :-e t man X was not very mwn "c^p . ! d to flitt^iY and It ci;mo the S r t> m I W.S rather 1 ke the Uoosier,with Aa"ln^cl. Id wUenh. a d he l'f ^o^a be 'otH t ' iHanm^fuie-mn,arid got less of 1 tiL,-*--^!*-.*^-. As the Judge had, so fl iftrrrVleitild not mate npjny mm d that 1 c mJ < < U aUuT v^iOx me; so I went o r\ik j ! bm thil he misunderstood the ' loe v-^ioo my speech ind that I really never ' InKnder to. t tl People at_w _wrtii^ one an- T*ji^ i y el 1.1 T ((l i mi- ry 0 hei hi a ^ l a lion C'JVC D si TCtv , -n u^ itidn the next time I met ^onngHld I ttsed this exyres- d no nsat u ider tiie Consutu- r mcl nation to enter into the no inletler witj the institutions ol U aj a upon bat Lmcom will not ea- tci uiu 'ii" S'a-e State- lmt will go to the DaiiKs r Oi.n on thH Mdc md f.hoot over! ilrtw-x^i H".i son sti,pybstep,iathehorse- nx, nail la the i _i ' UnicsJi ha shall (j 2ttLf.a3 i,jtil h? sh..il nave extii su^bed plavery in idl the States, the Union sSiaU be mssolved. Now 1 donU think that was exactly *!' way to treat a kind, amiable, intelligent gSntleman H4<M of ia4ji*^i I know if I had asked the Judge to show when or where it was I had saia that, it I didn't succeed in firing into the slave Slave States until slavery should be extin- guished, the Union should be dissolved, he Sould not have shown it. I iindeistand what he would do. He would say, " I don t mean to ouote from you, bnt this was the?cSMoi what you say." But 1 have the right to ask, and i do ask now, Did you not put it in such a form that an ordinary reader or listener would tuKe it as an expression from me / -ffetrgrtrter-J ^ lu a speech at SpringHeld, on the night oi the 17th, I thought I might as well attend to my own uusiiess a little, and I recalled his attentiu as well as I could to this charge ot conspiracy to nationalize Slavery. I called his attention to the act that he had acknowledged; ia my healing twice, that he had carefully read the speech, and, in the language of the lawyers, as he had twice read the speech, and stiU had put in no plea or I answer. 1 tooli a detaolt on him. X insisted taat 1 I had a riaht then to renew that charge ot con- J soii-acy. "Ten days afterwards, I met the Judge 1 at CliPton-that is to say, I was on the ground, but not in the discnssioii aiia hdard him make a sueech. Then he comes in with his plea to this charge, for the first time, andUis plea wheii put m as well as I can recollect it, amounted to this : t lat he never had any talk with Judge Tauey or the President of the United States with regard to the Dred-Scott decision before it was maae. 1 (Lm-eoln ought to know that the man who makes a charge without knowing it to- be true, lalsihasas much as he who knowi"gly tells a ia'8'i"0"! and lastly, that he would pronounce the whole thing a talsenood ; bat he would make no per- sonal application of the charge ot falsehood, not because of any regard for the "kmd, anuable i intelligent gentleman,"- but because o his own personal self-respect! ^jtwra of Ittugtrtrgr:- i 1 have understood since then, (but tarniag to Judge Douglas will not

hold the Judge to it (if he is not willing) that he has broken through the "self-reproach," and has got to saying the thing. O'rf The Judge nods to me that it is so. JiaffBtrter] It is fortunate for me that I can keep'as good-humored as I do, when the Judge acknowledges that he has been trying to mate a question of veracity with me. I know the Judge is a great man, while I am only a small man, but I feel that I have got him. f***tdoih6eriug.] I demur to that plea. I waive all objections that it was not filed till after default was taken, and demur to it upon the merits. What if Judge Douglas never did talk with Chief Justice Taney and the President, before the Dred Scott decision was made, does it follow* that he could^ not have had as perfect an understanding without talking, as with it? I am not disposed to stand upon my legal advantage. I am disposed to take his denial as being like an answer in chancery, that he neither had any knowledge, information or belief in the existence of such a conspiracy. I am disposed to take his answer as being broad, as though he had put it in these words. And now, I ask, even if you - ^^^- .sc. have not a right to prove it in this, and to offer the evidence of more than two witnesses, by whom. to prove it; and if the evidence proves the existence of the conspiracy Now in regard to his reminding me of a rule that persons who tell what they do not know to be true, falsify as much as those who knowingly tell falsehoods, I remember the rule, and it must be borne in mind that in what I have read to you, I do not say that I know such a conspiracy to exist. To that, I really / believe it. If the Judge says that I do not believe it, then he says what he does not know, and falls within his own rule, that he who asserts a thing which he does not know to be true, falsifies as much as he who knowingly tells a falsehood. I want to call your attention to a little discussion on that branch of the case, and the evidence which brought my mind_ to the conclusion which I expressed as my belief. If, in arraying that evidence, I had stated anything which was false or erroneous, it needed but that Judge Douglas should point it out, and I would have taken it back with all the kindness in the world. I do not deal in that way. If I have brought forward anything not a fact, if he will point it out, it will not even ruffle me to take it back. But if he will not point out anything erroneous in the evidence, is it not rather for him ! to show, by a comparison of the evidence that I have reasoned falsely, than to call the "kind, intelligent gentleman," a liar ?jfGthese nud.li>ualililil If I have reasoned to a false conclusion, it is the vocation of an able debater to show by argument that I have wandered to an erroneous conclusion. I want to ask your attention to a portion of the Nebraska Bill, which Judge Douglas has quoted : "It being the true intent and meaning of this act, not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." 'whereupon Judge Douglas and others began to argue in favor of "Popular Sovereignty"-the right of the people to have slaves if they wanted them, and to exclude slavery if they did not want them. "Hut," said, in substance, a Senator from Ohio, (Mr. Chase, I believe,) "we more than suspect that you do not mean to allow the people to exclude slavery if they wish to, and if you do mean it, accept an amendment which I propose expressly authorizing the people to exclude slavery." I

believe I have the amendment here before me, which was offered, and under which the people of the Territory, through their proper representatives, might if they saw fit, prohibit the existence of slavery therein. And now I state it as a fact, to be taken back if there is any mistake about it, that Judge Douglas and those acting with him, voted that amendment down. I now think that those men who voted it down, had a real reason, for doing so. They know what that reason was. It looks to us, since we have seen the Dred Scott decision pronounced holding that "under the Constitution" the people cannot exclude slavery I say it looks to outsiders, poor, simple, "amiable, intelligent gentlemen," as the niche was left as a place to put that Dred Scott decision in a niche which would have been spoiled by adopting the amendment. And now, I say again, if this was not the reason, it will avail the Judge much more to calmly and good-humoredly point out to these people what that other reason was for voting the amendment down, than, swelling himself up, to vociferate that he may be provoked to call somebody a liar, for saying "upplnii". Again : there is in that same quotation from the "Nebraska bill this clause " It being the true intent and meaning of this bill not to legis- late slavery into any Territory or State. I have always been puzzled to know what business the word "State " had in that connection. Judge Douglas knows. He put it there. He knows what he put it there for. * e outsiders cannot say what he put it there for. The law ' they were passing was not about States, and was not making provisions for States. What was it placed there for ? After seeing the Dred Scott , decision, which holds that the people cannot exclude slavery from a Territory, if another Dred Scott decision shall come, holding that they cannot exclude it from a State, we shall discover that when the word was originally put there it was in view of something which was to come' in due time, we shall see that it was the other half of something. . Appln I now say again. If there is any difflrent reason for putting it there. Judge Douglas, in a good-humored way, without calling anybody a liar, can tell what the reason was. . Raaawed flhoora-j- When the Judge spoke at Clinton, became very near making' a charge of falsehood against me He used, as I found it printed in a news- paper, which I remember was very nearly like the real speech, the following language : "I did not answer the charge of conspiracy before, for the reason that, I did not suppose there was a man in America with a heart so corrupt as to believe such a thing could be true. I have too much respect for Mr. Lincoln to believe he is serious in making the charge." I confess this is rather a curious view, that out of respect for me he should consider I was making what I deemed rather a grave charge in fun. I coufess it strikes me rather strangely. But I think Judge did not for a moment believe that there was a man in America whose heart was so corrupt" as to make such a charge, I hope he will excuse me if I hunt out another charge very like this; and if it should turn out that in making it, I should find that other, and it should turn out to be Judge Douglas himself who made it, I hope he will reconsider this question of the deep corruption of heart he has thought fit to ascribe to Douglas- speech of March 1858, which I hold in my hand, he says; my evidence proves the existence of

the conspi- racy, does his broad answer denying ail Kuowl- pilfiA inInvTYidfiriTi r.T IsnlinP .--i;.^* 1.
+1... j> ...C T+ edge, information, or belief, disturb the fact? It can only show that he was nsftd by
conspirators, and was not a leader of them. t**-eiteer-

||

ir^^-^Af^jSf^j... .jim^..^^ ItSfSm it^ "-'^ ^>*^*--J

I

ftM. _^>if:^^. || 'latliis connf ction thTe is another toiilc to wli'chi desh'j toyllude. I eld^m refer to the
couvs= of newspa ijei'B. or notice the arflclea which they puMish in regnrd to my^elf; bu', the couise
of ihe WwashiDgtcn Union has be n Koextrft'ir inary, f^rlhelE'rt two i-r three raonfebs thit I tliiilsit
well cnougli to uiake soma allusion to 1.'. ^nt hasreaii meout of tliej);mocr<itic piirty every o'her
^^ tiny, at least fottiyo or three mo^ttis, anu f-eeps readins- me out, Ciauh'her;) an'-, as If itbatt
not aupceeded still conii-u s ti> lead me out, using f-ich terms as "traitor," "renepade," "deseitei,"
Slid other k.nd ard polite eci- thetsofliatnature. Sir Thurero vlication toinalie of n;;y democracy
agei '*'.....-vi-ton Union, or ary fther ew=pap a. ' How my history irad action for the last twe life
for ihemselvts as to my poUtioai prnc v' 'e t'y to political ob- ilsatloDS. Tho W-fhlnaton Laion nas
a purjonw griOv- Boe. When its editor was nonjioatert for Public Primer I dcclloed to votg for him.
auct i itea that at bo e lime I mlghi K ve my reas"! afor doi so. Since I d 'clined to dvu that vote, t
jis scu rilous a^iijji; these vindictive and constant attaccs have been repeated aim at dally on me.
V^iU my friend ft cja Mi.jjig-in read the ar.icie to whkUl ai:ade." Tin' is a pait of tlio E;iecc'.i. You
must excuse me front reading the entire article of the Wash ington Union, as Mr. Stuai-t read
it for Jjlr. D.mg- las. The JoAge goes oa and sams up, as I think correctlj: IVlr.Presidsnt, you here
fi*(l s'veral dfejinct proposi- tions aivancedhoidyt-v the Wash'i-gr,in Union eiitor- a,ly and a oaren
ly authoritaUnely. and ev -vy man who Queaiions any of tk^mis'tcnomiceaas an Abolitionist,
a Krse-ao'ler, a f >nat!0. The prooositions are, Hrsi,. tnat t'eMimaryobi ct of all Eovernraent at
its origi.ia! insti- tution Is the p^o ection -f person and pr-pe.ty; second, !h the Oonstitution of
the United btBtes decla is hat heeiiaenaof each State ar.aH be entitled o all the privi- leges and
imiiiuriitiesi .;f oisizens la the several State ; aad -bat. therf ra, ihirrly, all State law.-!., whither cr- K -
nio or otherwise, whi n proMM, the citizens of o; i tto f cm settling in another with iheir slave propf
rty, an esoecial.y declar'ng it firfeited, are oii-e t violations iftueo'iginalfnttnlonoftH Cfover meut;nd
Coisti tu'tlon of the Unit-d ft tiesi fsart lonrth, at the emancl- pitionof th Slav s of tbe o.i.them statpa
was a gioss outraBeooiheribisof property ifsinaCOM it was m- volur.tariH? do e on tie pan or the
owaer, . ; B'mem' er that this article wis pubhslied in;the Unim on tiie 17tl! of November, aod on
the lth. apaeard ti:e fist article glvIngtheadiesloncf the Umimi to t^e Le- ^'H comptoacoastltution.
Itwaslathesew,ra^t --^ ' KiSJAS A- D HUE CossHTCTioN. The vexed duestkn ia settled. The prcb'em U

solved, the d-tad pjmt of d-iiig-sr i.g passed. Al. serious trouble to Kansas alialrs is, ever and gone" And cili'tnn, ne.rlv of thesame sort. Then, wien vou c metolookiato taa,..WLK>'?? *->nstitnton, vcnnr thesamoi. 'Ci-iuc 'f;i'-. *<|?'-V-t,}'". !* wMc'i was put f roh ed toviaily in he Union, : Vwhat is it? . " taTicLii 7, Secttttn 1. The right of property is before and higher 'ban any constitutional sanction; and the right < f ti^e owner of a slav to au h si we cDtl its mere se is the same and as inviolable as the right of the owner of any property w- atever." T^en in the s hedu e 1=! a p- ovision that the Co-stitu- tionmaj be ameadsd aftd 18M by a two-ihl dsvote, " But no alteratioo shall b-- made to affect the right of prope ty in tne ownership of slaves." It will be seen by these c'aus s in the Lecompton f^on- stUutt^ntiat hey are identical nsoir't with thsflMWO)-- itaUne article In the Wash ngton Unionpt the day previous t j its inaorsemej it of this Oousti.utioa. I pass over some portions of the speech, aiid I hope that any one who feels interested in this matter will read the entire section of the speech, and see whether I do the Judge injustice. He * proceeds; " When I saw that article in the Prejon of the 17th of ^^ovember, followed by the gioriflca on of the Lecom- ton OoQsttotioii on the S-h o! Novembir, a d <his lause in the Oonstrut on asserting the aoct-ine ;ht n State has no righ lo prol hit st ve y it in lis lmits, 1 -aw th^tt the.e w-is Jatal blow being struck at the sov- ereignty O thd Dtaiesoi this Union.' I stop the quotation there, again requesting that it may all be read. I have read all of the portion I desire to comment irpon. . What is tSiis charge that the Judge thinlss I must have a very oarrapt heart to malse ? It was a pur- pose on the part of certain high tunotionaries to malte it impossible for the people of one tate to prohibit the people of any other State from entering it with their "property," so called, and malsing it a skvS State. In other words, it was a charge implying a design to malfe the institution ot slavery national. And now I asl your attention to what Judge Douglas has himself done here. I linoW he made that part of the speech as a reason why he hadretusedto vote for a cer- usin man for public printer, but when we get at it, the charge itself is the very one I made' against him, that he thinks I am so corrupt for uttering. Now whom does he make that charge against? Does he make it against that newspaper editor merely ? No; he says it is tdential in spirit with the Lecompton Consti- tution and so the framers of that Constitution are brought in with the editor of the newspaper 1 in that " fatal blow being struck." He did not 1 call it a "conspiracy." In his language it is a " fatal blow being struck." And if the words carry the meaning better when changed , from a "conspiracy" into a "fatal blow being struck," I will change my expression and call it " fatal blow being struck." {Ohoopo ftadiaagh- terrt- We see the charge made not merely against the editor of the (/nion but all the fra- mer of the Lecompton Constitution; and not onlj so but the article was an authoritative arti- cle. By whose authority ? Is there any question but he means it was by the authority ol the President, and hit Sabinet the Administration ? Is there any sort tf question but he means to make that charge ? en there are the editors of the Union, the framers f the Lecompton Con- stitution, the President of the United States and his Cabinet, and all the supporters of the Le- ' compton CoBStitution in Congress and out ol Congress, who are all involved in this " fatal I blow being struck." I commend to Judge i Douglas' consttderatioB the question of /low cor- nipt a mtn's /

irart miut he to make siwh a charge/ aiteTtKKMijieanttg. Now my friends, I have but one branch of the sutiieot, in the little time I have left, to vfhicli to call your n^ttention, and as I shall come to a close attniseodof that hranclt, it is prob ble that I shall nit occupy qaite all the time allotted to me. Althousli on these questions I would like to ^aiK twice as long as I have, I could not enter upon another head and discuss it nproperly without running over my time. I ask the attention of the people here assembled and elsewhere.to tbe course that Judge Douglas is pursuing every day as bearmg upon this question of making slavery national. Hot going back to the records but taking the speeches he makes, the speeches he made yesterday and day before and tnakeS Constantly all over the coun- try I ask vour attention to them. In the hrst place what is nt national? Not\ -.. __. _ -^ __ ^-i -. ' the people ot Kentucky will shoulder their mus- kets and with a young nigger stuck on every bayonet march into Illinois and force them upon us. There is no danger of our going over there and making war upon them. Then what ia necessary for the nationalization of slavery ? It is simply the next Dred Scott decision. It is merely lor the Supreme Court to decide that no State un- der the Constitution can exclude it, just as they have already decided that under the Constitu- tion neither Congress nor the Territorial Leg- islature can do it. When that is decided and acquiesced in, the w ole thing is done. This being true, and this being the way as I think that slavery is to be made national, let us consider what Judge Douglas is doing every day to i hat end. In- the hrst place, let us see v.'bat influence he is exerting on public sentiment. In this and like oommanicies, public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fai; without it nothing can succeed. Consequent- ly he who moulds public sentiment, goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces deci- sions. He makes statutes and deoisious possible or impossible to be executed. This must be burn in mind, as also the additional fact that Jud;ie Douglas isa man of vast ihlluence, so great that It is enough lor many men to profess to believe anything, when they once find out tliat Judge Douglas professes to iielieve it. Consider also the altitude he occupies at tiie head of a large party a party which he claims has a m jiiiii of all the voters in the country. This man sticks to a decision which forbids the people of a Territory from excluding slavery, and he does so not because he says it is right io itself - he does not give any opinion on that - but because it has been decided by the court, and be ing decided by the court, he is, and you are bound to take it in your political action &&law not that he judges at all of its merits, but be cause a decision oi the Courtis to him a " Thus saith the Lord." -Appfjuae. He places it on that ground alone, i.nd you will bear in mind that thus committing himself unreservedly to this decision, commits Mm to the next one just as firmly as to this. He did not commit himself on account of tbe merit or demerit of the decision,but it is a Thus saith the Lord. The next decision, as much as this, will be a thus saith t Lord, yhere is nothing that can divert or turn him away from this decision. It is nothing that I point out to him that his great prototype. Gen. Jackson, did not believe in the binding force of decisions. It is nothing to him that Jefferson did not so believe. I have said that I have of en heard him approve ot Jackson's course in disregarding the decision of the Supreme Court pronouncing a National Bank constiitutional. He says, I did not hear him say so. He denies the

accuracy of my recollection. I say he ought to know better than I, but I will make no question about this thing, though it still seems to me that I should have said it twenty times. A principle which I will tell him, though, that he now claims to stand on the Cincinnati platform, which affirms that Congress cannot charter a National Bank, in the teeth of that old standing decision that Congress can charter a bank. And I remind him of another piece of history on the question of respect for judicial decisions, and it is a piece of Illinois history, belonging to a time when the large party to which Judge Douglas belonged, were displeased with a decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois, because they had decided that a Governor could not remove a Secretary of State. You will find the whole story in Ford's History of Illinois, and I know that Judge Douglas will not deny that he was then in favor of overruling that decision by the mode of adding five new Judges, so as to vote down the four old ones. Not only so, but it ended in the Judge's sitting down on that very bench as one of the five new Judges to break down the four old ones. It was in this way precisely that he got his title of Judge. Now, when the Judge tells me that men appointed conditionally to sit as members of a court, will be catechised beforehand upon their subject, I say "You know Judge; you have tried it," and I reply. When he says a court of this kind will lose the confidence of all men, will be disgraced by such a proceeding, I say, "You know best. Judge; you have been through the mill." But I cannot shake Judge Douglas' teeth loose from the Dred Scott decision. Like some obstinate animal (I mean no disrespect,) that will hang on when he has once got his teeth fixed, you may cut off a leg, or you may tear away an arm, still he will not relax his hold. And so I may point out to the Judge, and say that he is bespattered all over, from the beginning of his political life to the present time, with attacks upon judicial decisions I may cut off limb after limb of his political record, and strive to wrench him from a single dictum of the Court yet I cannot divert him from it. He hangs to the Dred Scott decision. These things show there is a purpose as strong as death and eternity for which he adheres to this decision, and for which he will adhere to all other decisions of the same Court. Such a Hibernian. Give us something besides Dred Scott. Give us Scott. . . . ' Mr. Lincoln. Yes; no doubt you will hear something that don't hurt. Now, having spoken of the Dred Scott decision, one more word and I am done. Henry Clay, my beau ideal of a statesman, the man for whom I fought all my humble life- Henry Clay once said of a class of men who would represent tendencies to liberty and ultimate emancipation, that they must, if they would do this, go back to the era of our independence, and muzzle the cannon which thunders its annual joyful shout; they must blow out the moral lights around us; they must penetrate the human soul, and eradicate there the

"-AkSSM^ - *a-j>i?-tl-%.jtr.,i*it:i lil r^jSf-'

love of liberty; and men and women then, could they perpetuate slavery in this country? h<mi-
ooboom. To my thmkinif, Jadife Doufflas ia, by his example and vast in- fluence, doing that very
thing in this communi- ty febews when he says that the negro has nothing in the Declaration of
Independence. Henry Ulay plainly understood the con- trary. Jndge Douglas is going back to the era
of oirr Revolution, and to the ex- tent of his ability, muzzling the cannon which thunders its annual
joyous return. When he invites any people willing to have slavery, to establish it, he is blowing out
the moral lights around us. fGbeerev^!- When he says he "cares not whether slavery is voted down
or voted up,"- that it is asacred right ot self government-he is in my judgment pene- trating the
human soul and eradioatmg the light of reason and the love of liberty in this American people,
fjiaimsiasticand-contitmed S^! And now I will only say that woen, aUthese means and appliances,
by Judge not' Mtn'vn. :ii3 attention to It when 1?* first'addressed asked him ,or an answer and 1
then predicted that he would not answer. aBrHWi-(r-ie8 aadoheers.) How does he answer. Why
that he was not on the committee that wrote the resolutions. -^IrfWRMerr) 1 then repeated the
next proposition coutained in the resolutions which was to restrict slavery in those states in which
it exists and asked him whether he endorsed it. Does he answer yes, or no? He says in reply " I
was not on the committee at the time; 1 was up m Tazewell." The next question I put to him was,
whether he was in favor of prohibiting tne admission of any more slave States into the Union. I
put the question to him distinctly, whether, if the people of the Territory, when they had sufficient
population to make a btate, should form their constitution recognizing slavery, he would vote for
or against its adnoission f-J*** -*rf") He is a candidate for the United benate, and it' 19 passible,
if he should be elected, that he would have to vote directly on that question. -4-*" .iwvor will.'-') I
asked him to answer me and you bringing' public 'Xhe Judge D'ouolas shall succeed in ., . sentfient
to .n exact accordance with his ovfn V ew.s when these fa^t as B^mmZ^ shall echo back all these
senti- neSs-when they shall com. repeat his views atidtoavowhis principles, and to ^ay al that he
Bavs on these mighty 'liestion^--then it needs nnlv the formalitv of the second Dred booti oe- fslL
%hL he endor^B - advance to m^ke Slavery alike 'awful in all tbs Stales-old as well ^ as new, Kort.
as wr-11 as South. ". My friends, that ends the chap!*j. _ .. i^i- Mu iioir-ttora'. DOUGLAS' REPLY.
Mr:-4^wftA8 Fellow citizens: I will now occupy the half hour allotted to me in replying to Mr. Lin-
coln. The first point to which I will call your attention is. as to what I said about the organization of
the Republican oarty in 185i, and the platform that was formed on the 5th of October, of that year,
and I will then put the question to Mr, Lincoln whether or not he approves of each article in that
platform ("he answered that already), and ask for a specific answer. (ii.H.e-.has~-aBswer**d"-....."-
XetL- aBMJ!9*k* him ~sw<jr,'-,&c.) 1 did not charge "hflirwttb'fting a uieinber ot the committee
which reported that platform. ("* YftCiijun-yiiiitn ililil '^) I charged that that platform was the platform
of the Repubjicay party adopted by them. The fact that it was the pUvtform of the Republican
party is not denied, b..l "r, Lincoln now says, that although bis name %,^'<^*^ii the couunittee which

reported it, that he does not think he was there, but thinks he was in Tazewell, hold my court. {""TfB'SSfi^^te^aw thfrf* ^ tte*teHf..l> ak y*-iilBeey . au4.a>o -iateEKKptiAth Now, I want to remind you Mr. Lincoln that he was at Springfield, when that convention was held, at that time those resolutions adopted. '^^Hif^^wr* .Sftji^ft*ifc;}fe"^^s*KHe--waa;t iimceihSte!^ M<^ Olovbr, chairman of the Republican committee hoie no Republican will interfere with me. Douglas, >vTOe mas^fts"listened to Mr. Lincoln attentively, \aj3d"-'^s respectabis men we ought to hear^'IKH*. Douglas, and without interruption. 41',iio'od.") A Jr. Douglas, resuming The point I am going to remind you Mr. Lincoln of is this: that after I had made my speech in 1854, during the fair, he gave me notice that he was going to reply to me the next day. I was sick at the time, but I staid over in Springfield to hear his reply and to reply to him. On that day this very convention, the resolutions adopted by which I have read, was to meet in the Senate chamber. He spoke in the hall of the House; and when he got through his speech my recollection is distinct, and I shall never forget it. Mr. Codding walked up as I took the stand to reply, and gave notice that the Republican State Convention would meet instantly in the Senate chamber, and called upon the Republicans to retire there and go into this very convention, instead of remaining and listening to me. (4;j3jK;feil;iifiei:s for Douglas.) Mr. Lincoln, interrupting, excitedly and angrily, added that I went along with them, (This interruption was made in a pitiful, mean, sneaking way, as Lincoln floundered around the stand.) Mr. Douglas Gentlemen, Mr. Lincoln tells me to add that he went along with them to the Senate chamber, I will not add that, because I do not know whether he did or not. Mr. Lincoln, again interrupting I know he did not. \ Two of the ^Republican committee here seized Mr. Lincoln, and by a sudden jerk caused him to disappear from the front of the stand, one of them saying quite audibly, "What are you making such a fuss for. Douglas didn't interrupt you, and can't you see that the people don't like it." Mr. Douglas I do not know whether he knows or not, that is not, the point, and I will yet faring; me to on the question. In the first place Mr. Lincoln was selected by the very men who made the Republican organization, on that day to reply to me. He spoke for them and for that party, and he was the leader of the party; and on the very day he made his speech in reply to me preaching up this same doctrine of negro equality, under the Declaration of Independence, this Republican party met in Convention. (Through the hearing of Lincoln's speech, and Codding, one of their leading men marched in the moment Lincoln got through, and gave notice that they did not want to hear me and would proceed with the business of the Convention. ^Btwh-ltMifc.^;wn,i^> 4hreexlieac8,-ata^) Still another fact. I have here a newspaper printed at Springfield, Mr. Lincoln's own town, in October, 1854; a few days afterwards, publishing these resolutions, charging Mr. Lincoln with entertaining these sentiments, and trying to prove that they were also the sentiments of Mr. Yates, the candidate for Congress. This has been published on Mr. Lincoln over and over again, and never before has he denied it. ^I'hraa.oUai-a,) But my friends, this denial of his that he did not act on the committee is a miserable quibble to

avoid the main issue, (;>pUBef>4**^""i-*.**s"^\) which is that this Republican platform declares in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law- Has Lincoln r.nswered whether he endorsed that or whether he would vote to admit a State into the Union, with slavery or without it, ss " own people might choose. (itjia^liua,. | -jbat-s th^4^il%'Z^mi~-^};>') li_.d not answer that question. -(" He never-wtfe") He dodges that question also, under the coyer that he was not on the Committee at the time, that he was not present when the platform was made. 1 want to know if he should happen to be m the Senate when a State applied for admission, with a consti- tution acceptable to her own people, he would vote to admit that State,^ if s'ayery was one f^^*^^^ | ^^^ answer. Mr-Jjisoots interrupting the third time excited- ly. No, Judge (Mr. Lincoln again disappeared 8vicldenl'yalded.bya.paUfroni-behmd.) jitr'PWBqti*. It is truj he gives the abolitionists to understand by a hint that he would not vote to admit such a State. And why? He goes on to say that the man who would talk about giving each State the right to have slavery, or not as it pleased, was akin to the man who would muzzle the guns which thundered forth the annual iovous return of the day of our independence. -Itioi-af Jiiiighitar) He says that that kind of talk is casting a blight on the glory of this country. What , is the meaning of that? That he is not in favor of each State having the right to do as it pleases on the slavery question? ("Stick it to him, "dBt iipare him," and applause.) I will put the question to him again and again, and I intend to force it out of him. .(immense applause.) Then a >ain, ihis platform which was made at Springfield bv his own party, when he was its ac knowledged head, provides that Republicans will insist on the abolition of slavery m the District of Columbia, and I asked Lincoln specifically whether lit exclude over which he agreed with them in that? Did you get an an swer?-it'5v-'A) He is afraid to answer it. (We .jvill not vote tor him.") He knows 1 will trot him down to Egypt. (4.aughter and cheers.) I intend to mske him answer there, ("that's right^") or I will show the people of Illinois that he does not intend to answer these questions. ("iS.eep him to the ,^oi8.C:~;. '-il&-Wi-^'^^j. '^'^^ ponvention to which I have been alluding goes tie further, and pledges itself to slavery from all the Territories the general government has exclusive jurisdiction north of 86 deg, SO min., as well as South. Now I want to know whether he approves that provision. (iHt'11 "" "" ""ai.-aad-f-hae-rs.'i I want him to an- swer and when he does, I want to know his opinion on another point, which is, whether he will redeem the pledge of this platform and resist the acquire- ment ol any more territory unless slavery therein shall be forever prohibited. I want him to answer this last question. Bach of the questions I have put to him are practical questions, questions based upon the fundamental principles of the Black Re- publican party, and 1 want to know whether he is the first, last and only choice of a party with whom he does not agree in principle.,. (" (Jreat applause,) (i(Bake him down."),) He does not deny but that that principle was unanimously adopted by the Re- pubhcan party; he does not deny that the whole ; Republican party is pledged to it; he does not deny that a man who is not faithful to it is faithless to i the Republican party, and now I want to know whether that party is unanimously in favor of a > man who does not adopt that creed and agree with them in their principles : I want to know whether

the man who does not agree with them, and who is afraid to avow his differences and who dodges the issue is the first, last and only choice of the Re- publican pai ty. (Fihiiwi") A voicu, how about the conspiracy ? Mr. OonGLAS, never mind, I will come to that soon enough, (firavo) Jndga, hnrra, tbree-efawrs ^orBtta^^ But the platform which I have read to you not only lays down these principles but it adds. BemVoed That in furtherance of these principles we will mesuohoonslltuioDalaad lawful means as shall seem best adapted totheir accomplishment, and that we will support no man tor office, under the g-neral or state Bovernment, who is not positively and fully committed to the support of these ormclules, and whose pevs nal character and conduct is not aSanteethat he Is reliable, and who shall not have ab- ui-ed old party allegiance and ties. .jiUiQttd,i--A4M> IMuw-liir-'- *e:) , , , ^u * The Black Republican party stands pledged that they will never support Lincoln until he has pledged hinioeU to tnat platform, ' (tfampndoas-apfOwat, .jaeatlirowing_.p their hats.,,,?..d shouting .you ve aat-feii") but he cannot devise his answer; he has Sot made up his mind, whether he will or not. (ftf^^t i"fri*r.) Hetelked about ererything else^ he cijua'ttikh of to ocoupyhis hour and a bajfi, and hh&M ioiAi ifct ihinf odlalylfciijpif moreltdi Ray, fvithnttrjr-----^n-tre for i 'frisiug ttrr.nswer tirese* queillionsjhe .siii- dowtt'lmjg- bertoro-.iis -time-was out. I i^^BSIIW!?) - Injrelation to Mr. Lincoln's charge of cMispiracT against oie, I have a word to say. !-_-^ecn to day he quotes a playful-part of his spet^" "at Sprihgfeld, about Stephen,, and James, and Frank- lin, AndJiager, and says that I did not-tak* excep- - tion to'it I did not answer it. and he repeats it again. - I did not take exception^^o this figure i ' ill's. He has a right to be as playful as he plesstj in throwing his arguments together, and I will not object; but I did take objection to his second Soripiitteld speech, in which he stated that he ^WI ' I m

S^\\

"^aiiS^f- 1 itji I I .^|^

'^--^*?i^a. \ ..\ I il mMp intended his hist speech as a charge ot corruption or conspiracy against the Supreme Court of the United States, President Pierce, President BuchoL:- an, and myself. That gave the offensive character to the charge. He then said that when he mads ii he did not lcnw whether it was true or not (iaughtyr), but inasmuch as JudgaUouglv^s had not deoKd it, although he had rieplieato the other parts of his speech three times, he repeated it as a charge ot conspiracy against me, thus charging me with moral turpitude. When he put it in that form I did say that inasmuch as he repeated the charge simply because I had not denied it, I would deprive him of the opportunity of ever repeating it again, by declaring that it was in all its bearings an infa- mous lie. ('I'hiinn ahnetg for.OCTagtiw.) He says be will repeat it until I answer his folly, and nonsense about Stephen, and Franklin, and Roger, and llob, and James. He studied that out, prepared that one sentence with the greatest care, committed it to memory, and put it in his first Springfield speech, and now be



carries that speech around and reads that sentence to show how pretty it is. ^ww^rter.) His vanity is wounded because I will not go into that beautiful figure of his about the building of a house. (RiiinTTi""1 }""g^-'~T) All I have to say is, that I am not green enough to let him make a charge which he acknowledges he does not know to be true, and then take up my time in answering it, when I know it to be false and nobody else knows it to be true -- I have not brought a charge of moral turpitude against him. When he, or any other man, brings one against me, instead of disproving it I will say' that It is a lie, and let him prove it if he can. ^Bu I have lived twenty-five years in Illinois I have served you with all the fidelity and ability which I possess, ("ThihW ift| " fffTV*!" ""^ -i.--n^j ^Q^ Sir. Ijincoln is at liberty to attack my public act.on, my votes, and my conduct; but when he dares to attack my moral integrity, by a charge of conspir- acy between myself, Chief Justice Taney, and the Supreme Court and two Presidents of the United States, I will repel it. (" Kte..e4-foi-Brg- Mr. Lincoln has not character enough for integ- rity and truth merely on his own ipse dixit to ar- raign President Buchanan, President Pierce, and nine judges of the Supreme Court, not one of whom would be complimented by bein.g pul on an: equality with him. (."-ftrf tiim again, Jhri'n' hniinn'miiii'ii) There is an unpardonable presumption in a man putting himself up before thousands of people, and pretending ihat his ipse dixit, without proof, with- out fact and without truth, is enough to bring down and destroy the purest and best of living men. 4iUteaJtittaK=**HW-eb<M<ja.") Fellow-citizens, my time is fast expiring; I must pass on. Mr. Lincoln wants to know why i voted against Mr. Chase's amendment to the Nebraska Bill. I will tell him. In the first pUca, the bill already conferred all the power which Con- gress had, by giving the people the whole power over the subject. Chase offered a proviso that they might abolish slavery, which by implication would convey the idea that they could prohibit by not in- troducing that institution. Gen. Cass asked him to modify his amendment, so as to provide that the people might either prohibit or introduce slavery, and thus make it fair and equal. Chase refused to so modify his proviso, and then Gen. Cass and all the rest nf us, voted it down. ^ mryt.:).ia^rt._f>.bafti,jBjj ,) l'iiose lacts appear on the journals and debatesof Congress, where Mr. Lincoln found the charge, and if he had told the whole truth, there would have been no necessity for me to occupy your time in ex- plaining the matter. (faaHgh'fcor-wa^^ nppluiiftii,) Mr. Lincoln wants to know why the word "state," as well as " territory," was put into the Nebraska Bill! I will tell him. It was put there to meet just such false arguments as he has been adducing. ^bftw^^ITWE.) That first, not only the people ot the territories should do as they pleased, but that when they come to be admitted as States, they should come into the Union with or without slavery, as the people determined I meant to knoclc in the head this Abolition doclriae of Mr. Lincoln's, that there shall be no more slave States, even if the people want them. (J^reraendous ap- ->.^Uuse>) And it does not do for him to say, or for any other Black Republican to say, that there is nobody in favor of the doctrine of no more slave States, and that nobody wants to interfere with the right of the people to do as they pi ase What was ttie origin of the Missouri difficulty and trie Missouri compromise? The people of Missouri formed a constitution as a slave State, and asked admission into the Union, but the Free

Soil party of the North being in a majority, refused to admit her because she had slavery as one of her institutions. Hence this first slavery agitation arose upon a State and not upon a Territory, and yet Mr. Lincoln does not know why the word . State was placed in the Kansas Nebraska bill. (jSiaat - jwhtighter --cmwl -{>plaag) The whole Abolition agitation arose on that doctrine of prohibiting a State from coming in with slavery or not, as it pleased, and tlifct same doctrine is here in this Republican platform of 1854; it has never been, repealed; and every Black,.Repubhcan stands pledged by that platform, ..never*^ vote for any man who is not in favor of it. " Yet Mr. Lincoln does not know that there is a man *;j the world who is in favor of preventing a State from coming in as it pleases, notwithstanding. The Springfield platform says that they, the Republican party, will not allow a State to come in under such circumstances. He is an ignorant man. '^t)tmws.) Now you see that upon these very points I am as far from bringing Mr. Lincoln up to the line as I ever was before. He does not want to avow his principles. I do want to avow' mine, as clear as sunlight in mid-day. {Ohser- and apiptaaft) Democracy is founded upon the eternal principle of right. ^^Xli**i-th-'*i-) The plainer these prin- ciples are avowed before tne people, the stronger will be the support which they will receive. 1 ""iW wish I had the power to make them so clear that they would shine in the heavens for every man, woman, and child to read. (.tw>nd fMDMmf.) The first of those principles that 1 would proclaim would be in opposition to Mr. Lincoln's doctrine of uniformity between the different States, and I would declare instead the sovereign right ot each State to decide the slavery question as well as all other dumentio questions for themselves, without interference from any other State or power whatsoever. J^LaaaiMm ~ 1.1 - Wheii that principle is reogniled you will hare peace and harmony and fraternal feeling between all the States of this Union, until you do recognize that doctrine there will be sectional warfare agitat- ing and distracting the country. What does Mr. Lincoln propose ? He says that the Union cannot exist divided into free and slave States. If it can- not endure thus divided, then he must strive to make them all free or all slave, which will inevita- bly bring about a dissolution ot the Onion. (Oiiw .ol..'.HiM..aau't do it.") Gentlemen, I am told that my time is ottt and I am obliged to stop. (Jitare-tieie VthreeHjiwei i ifei'B kjtffe.i?weai:i&'^15Btui 'Dwujilua.) n "9

K"-ii2" - - -r SSiifmim'Hii Mi! ^J^i^iz^^r^ c-^O f^l ^^ :?(.^yS~^X^.

-aMM^' .r SEBATE BE^WSBN y LjN fc'* u ky

r\ h .>(AT OTr. liincoJu's Speech. Mr.-XuiCQla was introdtted by Hon. .Thomas J. Tamer, and waa greeted with load cliers. When the applaoise had sabsided, he said: ' Ladiks and Gentlemen-Oq Saturday last, Judge Douglas and myself first met in pablic discussion.' He spo.te one hour, I an hour-and-a-half, and he replied for half an hour. The order is now reversed. I am to speak an hpur, he aa hour-and-a-haif, and then 1 am to reply tor halt an hour. ,Tobjection8that pertain to U. without "c^rtSiq^:i^^-^ am pledged te the admiss on ot any mo _ States into the Union, 1 state to jo'j ver^

ly that 1 would be ?'^.^'^ J uRon that P^utina Pof'r M^hre^xceedCgly glad to question. 1
 should be exceeoiDgjs^ ^^^^^ now that there would neyei be^o^ ^^^ State admitted into t^ ^^^.v
 h'allb?^'^ * '^ I I must add, that it .'^\^Jterritorial existence the Territories d''''S'^^ *^"a S * p^"?'^ *
 of a^y'^^ .S^'^JrSe and a clear field, shall, havmg a fa r ^<=l>a'=f. ^ ,ti tion, do aif, and then 1 am to
 reply . shall, having a lau >''''-. rjoastitution, lpro-J08e,to devote myself when they come to a^"?'''';
 ^ ^ hdopt a H .. '- --' such an extraordinary thing as ^^^^ Slave Oonstitntion, nninflaenced by tne
 during the first hour to the scope of waat was brought wMWlioouglMr within the range of his half
 hoar speech at Ottawa. Of course there was brought within the scope in that hait hour s speech
 something ot his own opening -Deech In the course of that opening argument Judge Doaglas
 proposed to me seven distinct iat^rogonetones in my speech of an hour and a half, I attended to
 some other parts of his speech, and incidentally, as 1 thought, answered one of the interrogatories
 then. I then distinctly intimated to him that 1 would answer the rest of his interrogatories J He made
 no intimatio i at the time ot the propo- sition, nor did he in his reply allude at all to ^ that suggestion
 of mine. 1 do hi m no iniustice m saviul that he occ.:ipied at least half ot his re- ply in dialing with
 me as thofgh I had refused \ to answer his interrogatories. I now pro- pose that I will answer anj
 oi the in- terrogatories, upon condition that he will will answer questions from me noo exceeding
 Uie same number. I give him an opportunity to ie- nond. The Judge remains silent. Ino.vsayto you
 that I will answer his ilit;- gatoiies, w'hether he answers mine or not ;.&w/^ ^''''^I^td I have done
 so, I shaU propound nime to him ^''^^0 the press ofwople asatast the Mat- {toia/on?i-&orter did
 uotYeach,* .eVstaad uiftii Mr/Lincorfhad saSken to this,!poinf. |>e pk* vils remarks weiftaken ^ a
 gentlctnarfm Fiee, viri, wl>o h* ppHtely furn^Ued theiA,t ua. y ^ I liave supposed myself, since the
 organization of the Republican party at Bloommngton.in May ?8o6, bound as a party man by the
 rlattorms ot the party, then and since. If in any interrogato- ries which I shall answer I go beyond
 the scope of what is within these platforms it will be per- ' oeived that no one is responsible but
 myself, i Having said thus much, 1 will take up the a Judge's luterrogatories as I find them printed
 in 1 the Chicago Times.aud answer them smaitm. In ' order that there may be no mistalie aoutit,!
 have copied the interrogatories m writing and also my answers to them. The first one of these
 interrogatories is in these words: Question 1." I desire to know whether Lincoln to-day stands, as he
 did in 1854. in favor of the i unconditional repeal of the fugitive slave la,T .'_ Answer. I do not now,
 nor ever did, stand m favor of the unconditional repeal qt the lugitive slave law. eiisSa*_*tWBj^" "
 0*^*." I Q 2 "I desire him to answer whether ne stau'ds pledged to-day, as he did in 1854, against the
 admission of anv more slave btatSs into the Union, even if the people want them ?' A I do not now,
 nor ever did, stand pledged against the admission of any more slave States into the Union. ., a Q 8.
 " I want to know whether he stands pledged against the admission ot a new St^ate into the Union
 with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make." A I do not stand pledged
 agamst the admis- sion of a new State into the Uuion, with sucl^ Constitution as the people of that
 State may se i fit to make. CiaB.a-liaod!~^a8*" J- "^ 6 4 "I wan't to know whether ne stands-o- i day

pledged to the abolition of slavery in the ' District of Columbia?" Slave Constitntion, ?n""=^""t "fhem
1 see presence.of t""^ .j'^^^^^rthTcountryT'but to L alternative, If we own the^ou^ admit them into
the ^- . *^^ d by the The third inte"g""^Ve1nra" I conceive, answer to the second it bemg, as ^h:"?
ou?:h'one"irn';egard to the abolition.f jvl ; in the District ot-^ol^^^^^^^^^^^^^ AeU slavery abolished
i*^5-,^f Sieve that Con- heie,"hatttrthe question or the abota^^^^ the Slave Trade between the
different St.ite3, i can truly answer, aa I have, that I am P'fSfj" no"h g about it.' It is a subject to which
1 have ot given that mature consideration that^ould. make me feel authorized to state a position or,
Rs to hold mysef entirelv bound by it. m oVer words, thit question has never been prom- inentireno
igh before me to induce me to n- vesti"ate whether we really have the Const tu ttional BOver to do
it. I could investigate it i 1 had suEent time, to bring myself to acouc- sion upon that sub ect, bat I
have not done so, and 1 say so frankly to you I^^^^. ^"f/ ""j^J^ Douglas. I must say, however that if
^fiouia be of opinion that Congress f21SaLng Coustitutional power to abolish *-f^ ^fjl the different
States, I should still uo Be in av'or'of the exercise of, that power-n e^s !'P-,---f7""i"IS'=f ^r^ratornoTe
^c^ p^e^u^ ^^^^^ ^^^>-^^ A I do not stand to-day pledged to the abo- lition of slavery in the District
of Columbia. Q 5 " I desire him to answer whether he stands'pledged to the prohibition of the
slave trade between the diiierent States ?" A I do not stand pledged to the prohibition of the slave
trade between the difierent States. 0 6 "1 desire to know whether he stands nledee'd to prohibit
slavery in all the Territories of the United States, North as well as South of the Missouri Compromise
line." , j , A I am impliedly, if not expressly, pledged to a' belief in the ri< U and duhj of Congress to
prohibit slavery in all the United States Terri- tories. tIMrtl?pll. u .V. V, Q 7 ' I desire him to answer
whether he c ppose'd to the acquisition of any new territo unless slavery is first prohibited therein.
A I am not generally opposed to honest rmsi'tion of territory; and, in any given cas would or would
not oppose such acqusition cordiDgly as I might think such acqui^iy ,, would or would not aarift*
^^t^j^W"" "" ""now my friends, it will be perceived upon an cximination'of these questions and
answers, thH so far I have only answered that I was not I fiUdqfd to this, that or the other. The Judge
has not framed his interrogatories to ask me any- thing more than this, and I have answered m strict
accordance with the interrogatories, and have answered truly that I am not pluaged at all upon
any of the points to which 1 have an- swered But I am not disposed to hang upon the exact form
of his interrogatory. 1 am rather disposed to take up at least some of these questions, and state
what I really think upon them. . j , i,, ,^ .- As to the first one, in regard to the lugitive Slave Law I have
never hesitated to say, and 1 do not now hesitate to say, that I thiDk, under the Constitution of the
United States, the people of the Southern States are entitled to a Congres- sional Fugitive Slave Law.
Having said that, I have had nothing to say in regard to tbe exist- ing Fuaitive Slave Law further than
that I think it^hou'd hseve been framed so as It> be free from i. ^.^rtrXrihave's'ard rn^eTation to the
alioSn oflavery in the District ot Columbia. Ky answer as to whether I desire that slave rv should be
prohibited in all tre Territories of Se United States is full and explicit within ^- self, and cannot be
made clearer by any com mentsofmiue. So 1 suppose "yegard to * question whether I am opposed

to the acquisition of any more territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein, my answer is such that I could add nothing by way of illustration, or making myself better understood, than the answer which I have placed in writing. Now in all this, the Judge has lied and he has me on the record. I suppose he had flattered himself that I was really entertaining one set of opinions for one place and another set for another place - that I was afraid to say at one place what I uttered at another. What I am saying here I suppose I say to a vast audience as strongly tending to Abolitionism as any audience in the State of Illinois, and I believe I am saying that which, if it would be repeated to any persons and render them enemies to myself, would be offensive to persons in this audience. I now proceed to propound to the Judge the interrogatories, so far as they have framed them. I will bring forward a new installment when I get them ready. LunnltfiM I will bring them forth now, only reaching to number four. ' The first one is . , i (Question 1. If the people of Kansas shall, by ' means entirely unobjectionable in all other respects, adopt a State Constitution, and ask admission into the Union under it, before they have the requisite number of inhabitants according to the English Bill - some ninety-three thousand will you vote to admit them in the name of the people of a United States Territory in any lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution! (Ct 9d => 4-i , Q 3 If the Supreme Court of the United States shall decide that States can not exclude slavery from their limits, are you in favor of acquiescing in, adopting and following such decision as a rule of political action? - t***""*?^ .ptascj* ^^^^ favor-of acquiring additional territory, in disregard of how such acquisition may affect the nation of the slavery question? *^^Sf!^o'if^^"SInte"ogatories which Judge Douglas propounded to me at Ottawa he reads a set of resolutions which he said Judge Trumbull and myself had participated in adopting in the first Republican State Convention held at Springfield, in October, 1854. He insisted that I and Judge Trumbull, and perhaps the entire Republican party were responsible for the doctrines contained in the resolutions which he read, and I understand that it was from that set of resolutions that he deduced the interrogatories which he propounded to me using these resolutions as a sort of authority for propounding those questions. ^^^.w^^W*.*-^ ""% %;- if Our - y^ - e^ :mk

-MS>>. -,r^ '\$ 1; asks to me. Now X says here to day that I do not answer his interrogatories because of their springing at all from that set of resolutions. I answer him that I do not now, nor never did recognize any responsibility upon myself in that set of resolutions. When I replied to him on that occasion, I assured him that I never had anything to do with them. I repeat here to-day, that I never in any possible form had anything to do with that set of resolutions. It turns out I believe, that those resolutions were never passed in any Convention held in Seneca Falls. I turn to the resolutions which he read, and I understand that it was from that set of resolutions that he deduced the interrogatories which he propounded to me using these resolutions as a sort of authority for propounding those questions. I believe it turns out in addition to all this,

that there was not, in the fall of 1854, any Convention holding a session at Springfield, calling itself a Republican Convention; yet it is true there was a Convention, or assemblage of men calling themselves a Convention, at Springfield, that did pass some resolutions. But so little did I really know of the proceedings of that Convention, or what set of resolutions they had passed, though having a general knowledge that there had been such an assemblage of men there, that when Judge Douglas read the resolutions, I really did not know but they had been the resolutions passed then and there. I did not question that they were the resolutions adopted. For I could not bring myself to suppose that Judge Douglas could say what he did upon this subject without knowing that it myself, on that occasion, with denyino-, as I truly could, all connection with them, not denying or ascertaining whether they were passed at Springfield. Now it turns out that he had got hold of some resolutions passed at some Convention or public meeting in Kane County. (I wish to say here that I don't conceive that in any fair and just mind this discovery relieves me at all. I had just as much to do with the Convention in Kane County as that at Springfield. I am just as much responsible for the resolutions at Kane County as those at Springfield, the amount of the responsibility being exactly nothing in either case; no more than there would be in regard to resolutions huge to this extraordinary matter in this canvass for some farther purpose than anything yet advanced. Judge Douglas did not make his statement upon that occasion as matters that he believed to be true, but he stated them roundly as being true, in such form as to pledge his veracity for their truth. When the whole matter turns out as it does, and when we consider who Judge Douglas is that he is a distinguished Senator of the United States that he has served nearly twelve years as such that his character is not at all limited as an ordinary Senator of the United States, but that his name has become of world-wide renown it is most extraordinary that he should so forget all the suggestions of justice to an adversary, or of prudence to himself, as to venture upon the assertion of that which the slightest investigation would have shown him to be wholly false. I can only account for his having done so upon the supposition that that evil genius which has attended him through his life, giving to him an apparent astonishing prosperity, such as to lead very many good men to doubt there being any advantage in virtue over rascaliousness. I say I can only account for it on the supposition that that evil genius has at last made up its mind to forsake him. And I may add that another extraordinary feature of the Judge's conduct in this canvass made more extraordinary by this incident is that he is in the habit, in almost all the speeches he makes, of charging falsehood upon his adversaries myself and others. I now ask whether he is able to find in anything that Judge Trumbull, for instance, has said, or in anything that I have said, a justification at all compared with what we have, in this instance, for that sort of vulgarity that I have been in the habit of charging as a matter of belief on my part, that, in the introduction of the Nebraska bill into Congress, there was a conspiracy to make slavery perpetual and national. I have arranged from time to time the evidence which establishes and proves the truth of this charge. I recurred to this charge at Ottawa. I shall not now have time to

dwelt upon it at very great length; but inasmuch as Judge Douglas in his reply of half an hour, made some points upon me in relation to it, I propose noticing a few of them. The Judge insists that, in the first speech I made, in which I very distinctly made that charge, he thought for a good while I was in fun! that I was playful that I was not sincere about it and that he only grew angry and somewhat excited when he found that I insisted upon it as a matter of earnestness. He says he characterized it as a falsehood as far as I implicated his moral character in that transaction. Well, I did not know, till he presented that view that I had implicated his moral character. He is very much in the habit, when he argues me up in- to/* position I never thought of occupying, of very cosily saying he has no doubt Lincoln is "conscientious" in saying so. He should remember that I did not know but what he was altogether the "bookish" man of that matter. For I can conceive it possible for men to conspire to do a good thing, and I really find nothing in Judge Douglas' course or arguments that is contrary to or inconsistent with his belief of a conspiracy to nationalize and spread slavery as being a good and blessed thing, and so I hope he will understand that I do not at all question but that in all this matter he is entirely conscientious." Now let me draw your attention to one of the points I made in this case, beginning at the beginning. When the Nebraska bill was introduced, or a short time afterwards, by an amendment I believe, it was provided that it must be considered "the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, or to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." I have called his attention to the fact that when he and some others began arguing that they were giving an increased degree of liberty to the people in the Territories over and above what they formerly had on the question of slavery, a question was raised whether the law was enacted to give such unconditional liberty to the people, and to test the sincerity of this mode of argument. Mr. Chase, of Ohio, introduced an amendment, in which he made the law if the amendment were adopted expressly declare that the people of the Territory should have the power to exclude slavery if they saw fit. I have asked attention also to the fact that Judge Douglas and those who acted with him, voted that amendment down, notwithstanding it expressed exactly the thing they said was the true intent and meaning of the law. I have called attention to the fact that in subsequent times, a decision of the Supreme Court has been made in which it has been declared that a Territorial Legislature has no constitutional right to exclude slavery. And I have argued and said that for men who did intend that the people of the territory should have the right to exclude slavery absolutely and unconditionally, the voting down of Chase's amendment is wholly inexplicable. It is a puzzle a riddle. But I have said that with men who did look forward to such a decision, or who had it in contemplation, that such a decision of the Supreme Court would or might be made, the voting down of that amendment would be perfectly rational and intelligible. It would keep Congress from coming in collision with the decision when it was made. Anybody can conceive that if there was an intention or expectation that such a decision was to follow, it would not be a very desirable party

attitude to get in- to for the Supreme Court all or nearly all its members belonging to the same party to de- cide one way, when the party in Congress had decided the other way. Hence it would be very rational for men expecting such a decision, to keep the niche in that law clear for it. After pointing this out, I tell Judge Douglas that it looks to me as though here was the reason why Chase's amendment was voted down. I tell him that as he did it, and knows why he did it, if it was done for a reason different from this, he knows what that rea- son was, and can tell us what it was. I tell him, also, it will be vastly more satisfactory to the country, for him to give some other plausible, in- telligible reason why it was voted down than to stand upon his dignity and call people liars. -ffSK3SB8Bra. Well, on Saturday he did make his answer, and Vi'hatdoyou think it was? He savsiilhad only taken upon myself to tell the whole truth about that amendment of Chase's no explanation would have been necessary on his part or words to that effect. Now, I say here, that I am quite nncoasious of having suppressed anything material to the case, and I am very frank to admit if there is any sound reason other than that which ap- peared to me n aterial, it is quite fair for him to present it. What reason does he propose? That when Chase came forward with his amendment expressly authorizing the people to exclude slavery from the limits of every Territory, Gen. Cass proposed to Chase, if he (Chase) would add to his amendment that the people should have the power to introduce or exclude, they would let it go. (This is substantially all of his reply,) And because Chase would not do that, they vo- ted his amendment down. Well, it turns out, I believe, upon examination, that General Cass took some part in the little run- ning debate upon that amendment, and then ran away and did not vote on it at all. ftwiimli tW . Is not that the fact? So confident, as I think, was Gen. Cass, that there was a snake somewhere about, he chose to run away from the whole thing. This is an inference I draw from the fact that though he took part in the debate, his name does not appear in the ayes and noes. But does Judge Douglas' reply amount to a sat- isfacto^aMwer? J^SSss...sit-ilJ6s,". "ye," .48lfcSSfflr^J*iWf" There is some little aiff'er- enoe of opinion here. ^iiijh>j, But I ask attention to a few more views bearing on the question ot whether it amounti to a satisfactory answer. The ff en, who were determined that that amendment should not get into the bill and spoil the place where the Dred Scott de- cision was to come in, sought an excuse to get rid ul it somewhere. One of these ways one of these excuses-was to ask Chase to add to his proposed amendment a provision that the people might introduce slavery if they wanted to. They very well knew Chase would do no such thing that Mr. Chase was one of the men differing from them on the broad principle of his insisting that freedom was better than slav- ery a man who would not consent to enact a law, penned with his own hand, by which he was made to recognize slavery on the one hand and liberty on the other &apreciselt/ equal; and when they insisted on his doing this, they very well knew they insisted on that which he would not for a moment think of doing, and that they were only bluf- bluffing him. I believe (I have not, since he made his answer, had a chance to examine the journals or Congressional Globe, and therefore speak from memory) I believe the state of the bill at that time, according to parliamentary rules, was such that no member could propose ' an additional

amendment to Chase's amend- ment. I rather think this is the truth the Judge shakes his head. Very well. I would like to know, then, if they wanted Chase's amendment fixed over, why somebody else could not have offered to do it? If they wanted it amended, why did they not offer the amend- ment ? Why did they stand there taunting and quibbling at Chase? (MM*4 Why did they not put it in themselves f But to put it on the other ground; suppose that there was such an amend.nent offered, and 11 I

'^iasatt^----- '*' '---" | r 11

Sii...jah..C' ' tliase s was an amendment to an amendment- until one is disposed of by parliameutarr law' you cannot pile another on. Then all these aen- tlemen had to do was to vote Chase's on, and then in the amended form in which the whole stood, add their own amendmeet to it if they wanted it put in that shape. This was all they were obliged to do, and the ayes and noes show- that there were 36 who voted it down, against 10 who yoted in favor of it. The 36 held entire sway and control. They could in some form or o.her haye put that bill in ihe exact shape they wanted. It there was a rule preyingnting their amending it at the time, they could pass that and then Chase's amendment being merg- ed, put it in the shape they wanted. Ihey did not choose to do so, but they went into a quibble with Chase to get him to add what they knew he would not add, and because he would not, they stand upon that flimsy pretext for voting down what they argued was the mean- ing and intent of their own bill. They left room thereby for this Dred Scott decision, which goes very far to make slavery national throughout the United States. / I pass one or two points I have because my time will very soon expire, but I must be al- lowed to say that Judge Douglas recurs again, as he did upon one or two other oc- casions, the enormity of Lincoln an insig- nificant individual like Lincoln- upoli his ipse dixit charging a conspiracy upon a large uumoer ol members of Congress, the Supreme Court and two Presidents, to nationalize slavery. I want to say that, in the first place, I have made no charge of this sort upon my ipse dixit. I have only arra> ed the evidence tending to prove it, and presented it to the understanding ot oth- cis, saying what I think it proves, but giving you the means of judging whether it proves it or not. This is precisely what I have done. 1 have not placed it upon my ipse dixit at all. On this occa- sion, I wish to recall his attention to a piece of evidence which I brought forward at Ottawa on Saturday, showing that he had made substantially the same charge against substantially the same persons, excluding his dear self from the category. I ask him to give some attention to the evidence which I brought forward, that he himself had discovered a ' fatal blow being struck " against the right ot the people to exclude slavery from their lim- its, which fatal blow he assumed as in evidence in an article in the Washington Union, pub- lished " by authority." I ask by whose author- ity ? He discovers a similar or idemical pro- vision in the Lecompton Constitution. Made by whom? The framers of that Constitution, Advocated by whom? By all ihe members of the; party in the nation, who advocated the introduction of Kansas into the Union under the Lecompton

Constitution. I have asked his attention to the evidence that he arrayed to prove that such a fatal blow was being struck, and to the facts which he brought forward in support of that charge being identical with the one which he thinks so villainous in me. He pointed it not at a newspaper editor merely, but at the President and his Cabinet and the members of Congress advocating the Lecompton Constitution and those framing that instrument. I must again be permitted to remind him, that although my ipse dixit may not be as great as his, yet it somewhat reduces the force of his calling my attention to the enormity of my making a like charge against him. Go on, Judge Douglas. / .VSf*^;-' DOUGLAS' SPEECH. - ! Laiden and (gentlemanly-The. silence with which you testified to the honor of Mr. Lincoln during his hour is creditable to this vast audience, composed of men of various political parties. Nothing is more honorable to any large mass of people assembled for the purpose of a fair discussion, than that kind and respectful attention that is yielded not only to your political friends, but to those who are opposed to you in politics. I am glad that at last I have brought Mr. Lincoln to the conclusion that he will better define his position on certain political questions to which I called his attention at Ottawa. He there showed no disposition, no inclination to answer them. I did not present idle questions for him to answer merely for my gratification. I laid the foundation for those interrogatories by showing that they constituted the platform of the party whose nominee he is for the Senate. I did not presume that I had the right to catechise him as I saw proper, unless I showed that his party, or a majority of it, stood upon the platform and were in favor of the propositions upon which my questions were based. I desired simply to know, inasmuch as he had been nominated as the first, last, and only choice of his party, whether he concurred in the platform which that party had adopted for its government. In a few moments I will proceed to review the answers which he has given to these interrogatories; but in order to relieve his anxiety I will first respond to those which he has presented to me. Mark you, he has not presented interrogatories which have ever received the sanction of the party with which I am acting, and hence he has no other foundation for them than his own capriciousness. (ii) First, he desires to know if the people of Kansas shall form a constitution by the means entirely proper and unobjectionable and ask admission into the Union as a State, before they have the requisite population for a member of Congress, whether I will vote for that admission. Well, now, I regret exceedingly that he did not answer that interrogatory himself before he put it to me, in order that we might understand, and not be left to infer, on which side he is. (iii) Mr. Trumbull, during the last session of Congress, voted from the beginning to the end against the admission of Oregon, although a free State, because she had not the requisite population for a member of Congress. (iv) Mr. Trumbull would not consent, under any circumstances, to let a State, free or slave, come into the Union until it had the requisite population. As Mr. Trumbull is in the field, fighting for Mr. Lincoln, I would like to have Mr. Lincoln answer his own question and tell me whether he is fighting Trumbull on that issue or not. (v) In reference to Kansas; it is my opinion, that as she has population enough to constitute a slave State, she has people enough for a free State. (vi)

I will not make Kansas an exceptional case to the other States of the Union. I hold it to be a sound rule of universal application to require a territory to contain the requisite population for a member of Congress, before it is admitted as a State into the Union. I made that proposition in the Senate in 1856, and I renewed it during the last session, in a bill providing that no territory of The United States should form a constitution and apply for admission until it had the requisite population. On another occasion I proposed that neither Kansas, or any other territory, should be admitted until it had the requisite population. Congress did not adopt any of my propositions containing this general rule, but did make an exception of Kansas. I will stand by that exception, however. Either Kansas must come in as a free State, with whatever population she may have, or the rule must be applied to all the other territories alike. I therefore answer at once, that it having been decided that Kansas has people enough for a slave State, I hold that she has enough for a free State. Mr. Lincoln is satisfied with my answer; and now I would like to get his answer to his own interrogatory whether or not he will vote to admit Kansas before she has the requisite population, if I wish to know whether he will vote to admit Oregon before that Territory has the requisite population. Mr. Trumbull will not, and the same reason that commits Mr. Trumbull against the admission of Oregon, commits him against Kansas, even if she should apply for admission as a free State. If there is any sincerity, any truth in the argument of Mr. Trumbull in the Senate against the admission of Oregon because she had not 93,420 people, although her population was larger than that of Kansas, he stands pledged against the admission of both Oregon and Kansas until they have 93,420 inhabitants. I would like Mr. Lincoln to answer this question. If he differs with Mr. Trumbull, let him answer his argument against the admission of Oregon, instead of posing questions at me. The next question propounded to me by Mr. Lincoln is, can the people of a territory in any lawful way against the wishes of any citizen of the United States; exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution? I answer emphatically, as Mr. Lincoln has heard me answer a hundred times from every stump in Illinois, that in my opinion the people of a territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution. Mr. Lincoln knew that I had answered that question over and over again. He heard me argue the Nebraska bill on that principle all over the State in 1854, in 1855 and in 1856, and he has no excuse for pretending to be in doubt as to my position on that question. It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question whether slavery may or may not go into a territory under the constitution, the people have the lawful means to introduce it or exclude it as they please, for the reason that slavery cannot exist a day or an hour anywhere, unless it is supported by local police regulations. Those police regulations can only be established by the local legislature, and if the people are opposed to slavery they will elect representatives to that body who will by unfriendly legislation

effectually prevent the introduction of it into their midst. If, on the contrary, they are for it, their legislation will favor its extension. Hence, no matter what the decision of the Supreme Court may be on that abstract question, still the right of the people to make a slave territory or a free territory is perfect and complete under the Nebraska bill. I hope Mr. Lincoln deems my answer satisfactory on that point. In this connection, I will notice the charge which he has introduced in relation to Mr. Chase's amendment. I thought that I had chased that amendment out of Mr. Lincoln's brain at Ottawa; (but it seems that it still haunts his imagination, and he is not yet satisfied, I had supposed that he would be ashamed to press that question further. He is a lawyer, and has been a Member of Congress, and has occupied his time and amused you by telling you about parliamentary proceedings. He ought to have known better than to try to palm off his miserable impositions upon this intelligent audience, ("flimdyll and oheers.") The Nebraska bill provided that the legislative power, and authority of the said Territory, should extend to all rightful subjects of legislation consistent with the organic act and the Constitution of the United States. It did not make any exception as to slavery, but gave all the power that it was possible for Congress to give, without violating the Constitution to the Territorial Legislature, with no exception or limitation on the subject of slavery at all. The language of that bill which I have quoted, gave the full power and the full authority over the subject of slavery, affirmatively and negatively, to introduce it or exclude it, so far as the Constitution of the United States would permit. What more could Mr. Chase give by his amendment? Nothing. He offered his amendment for the identical purpose for which Mr. Lincoln is using it, to enable demagogues in the country to try and deceive the people. ('*<ii<8S',t'AttSd> His amendment was to this effect. It provided that the Legislature should have the power to exclude slavery; and General Cass suggested "why not give the power to introduce as well as exclude?" The answer was, they have the power already in the bill to do both. Chase was afraid his amendment would be adopted if he put the alternative proposition and so make it fair both ways, but would not yield. He offered it for the purpose of having it rejected. He offered it, as he has himself avowed over and over again, simply to make capital out of it for the stump. He expected that it would be capital for small politicians in the country, and that they would make an effort to deceive the people with it, and he was not mistaken, for Lincoln is carrying out the plan admirably. -^'-S*taBia;igeiir") Lincoln knows that the Nebraska bill, without

Mfe** : ^' / \ ' V

1. onstUuViou wouiajieniut.. Ljoum t'ongresw coiiter any more ? () Could Congress go beyond the Constitution of the country? We gave all, a full grant, with no exception in regard to slavery one way or the other. We left that question - i???- *^""^?'* *'' others^t(^e deoMsd by thnjion. ruL-ked liis brain S iL \\ould bowilh tliis great nation.- With our natural increase, growing withli ^^^_ ariiiiidity unknown in

any oilier part otj rap, tlic dole, with tlic tkle of emigration 1^ that is fleeing from despotism in"tlie old world to seek refuge in our own, there is i a constant torrent pouring into this coun- try that requires more land, more territo- ry upon w' pie for themselves, just as they pleased. I will not occupy my time on this question. I have ar- gued it before all over Illinois. I have argued it in this beautiful city ol Freeport; I have ar- gued it in the North, the South, the E-ast and the West, avowing the same sentiments and the same principles. 1 have not been afraid to avow ray sentiments up here for fear I would be trotted down inliiKgypt. (Ct8P-'**l*8***'-) , . Ti;e third question which i\lr. Lincoln presented IS, if IUe Supreme Court of the United States shall decide that a State of this Union cannot exclude slavery from its own limits will I submit to it ? I am amazed that Lincoln should ask such a ques- tion yH>^ ggdnpli >!>y-kaaw8--toH,") Yes, a school boy does know better. Mr. Lincoln's object is to cast an imputation upon the Supreme Court. He knows that there never was but one man m America, claiming any degree of mtelligence or decency, who ever for a moment pretended such a thing. It is true that the Washington Union, in an article published on the 17th of last December, did put forth that doctrine, and I deuouiiced the article on the floor of the Senate, in a speech which Mr. Lincoln now pretends was against the Presi- dent. The Union had claimed that slavery had a right to go into the free States, and that any provision in the Constitution or laws of the free States to the contrary were null and void, I denounced it in the Senate, as 1 said before, and I was the first man who did. Lincoln's friends, TrumbuU, and Seward, and Hale, and Wilson, and the whole Black Republican side of the Senate were, silent. They left it to me to denounce it. ^fjltioirt) And what was the reply made to me on that occasion? Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, got up and undertook to lecture me on the ground that I ought not to have deemed the article worthy of notice, and ought not to have replied % it; that there was not one man, woman or child south of the Potomac, in any slave State, who did not repudiate any such pretenSion. Mr. Lincoln knows that that reply was made on the spot, and yet now he asks this question. He might as well ask me, sup- pose .Mr. Lincoln should steal a horse would I sanc- tion it; ^i*H14gr,) and it would be as genteel in tBe to a-ik him, To the event he stole a horse, what ought to be done with him. .tie oasts an imputa- tion upon the Supreme Court of the United States bv supposing that they would violate the Constitu- tion ol the United States. I tell him that such a thing is not pos ible. (Cfce*.) It would be an act uC moral treason that no man on the bench could ever defcend to. Mr. Lincoln himself would never in his partisan feelings so far forget what was right as to be guilty of such an act. {iUiifm^ The fourth question of Mr. Lincoln i.H, are you in favor of acquiring additional territory in disregard as to how such acquisition may effect the Union on the slavery questions. This question is very ingeni- ouilv and cunningly put. - fkaaap jff.oss here spoke, eoUo - Mfi, tbe.-J>e- portBi-BndwS&Bijtng him to say, "Now -we've got him." The Black Republican creed lays it down express- ly, that under no circumstances shall we acquire any more territory unless slavery is first prohibited in the country. I ask Mr. Lincoln whether he is in favor of thSt proposition. Are you (ad- dr ssing Mr. Lincoln) opposed to the ac- quisition of any more territory, under any cir cumstances, unless slavery is prohibited in it? That he does not

like to answer. When I ask him whether he stands up to that article in the platform of his party, he turns, yaukee-fashion, and without answering it, asks me whether I am in favor of acquiring territory without regard to how it may affect the Union on the slavery question, I answer that whenever it becomes necessary, in our growth and progress to acquire more territory, that I am in favor of it, without reference to the question of slavery, and when we have acquired it, I will leave the people free to do as they please, either to make it slaver-free territory, as they prefer. Here Deadcm-SrOW *pt)ke, the reporter .b lieE*is;iiU..he said, "That's bold." It was said sal- wm'tyi.>.It is idle to tell me or you I think we have territory enough. Our fathers supposed that we had enough when our territory extended to the Mississippi river, but a few years' growth and expansion satisfied them that we needed more, and the Louisiana territory, from the West branch of the Mississippi, to the British possessions, was acquired. Then we acquired Oregon, then California and New Mexico. We have enough now for the present, but this is a young and a growing nation. It swarms as often as a hive of bees, and as new swarms are turned out ^,^6-. year. there must be hives in which they can gather and make their honey. (iBd.)iQless than fifteen years, if the same progress that has distinguished this country for the last fifteen years continues, every foot of vacant land between this and the Pacific ocean, owned by the United States, will be occupied. Will you not oblige me to increase at the end of fifteen years as well as now? I tell you, increase, and multiply, and expand, is the law of this nation's existence. "(laSWH) You cannot limit this great republic by mere boundaries, saying, "thus far shall thou go, and no further." Any one of you gentlemen might as well say to a son twelve years old that he is big enough, and must not grow any larger, and in order to prevent his growth put a hoop around him to keep him to his present size. What would be the result? Either the hoop must burst and be rent asunder, or the child must die. So it would be with this great rich 'ith our natural increase, growing with a known in any other part of the globe, with ^nigration that is fleeing from despotism, a world to seek a refuge in our own, the continual torrent pouring into this country that > ^<jires more land, more territory upon which to settle, and just as last as our interests and our duties require additional territory in the north, in the south, or on the islands of the ocean, I am for it, and when we acquire it will leave the people, according to the Nebraska bill, free to do as they please on the subject of slavery and every other question. (Seeds-twod-i-bu'r,. 'o: !. u ; '. answei eel on I:ls tour ponii,^ . 90 much in devising these four questions that he exhausted himself, and had not strength enough to invent the others. (iMBijhiiiir) As soon as he is able to hold a council with his advisers, Lovejoy, Farnsworth, and Fred. Douglass, he will frame and propound others. (UftfijU- ue^ Ac Renewed laagbter >n which SI.r. Liasuin.f6eWjr. joi'>"<iff*y- iog that he hoped with their aid to get seven questions the number asked him by Judge Douglas. and sit, niafc'e confiludQm even.) You Black Republicans who say "good, I have no doubt think that they are all good men. -^Wte, white. 1 1 b-ave reason to collect that some people in this country think that Fred. Douglass is a very good man. The last time I came here to make a speech, while talking from the slated to you, people of Freeport, as I am doing to day, I saw a carriage and a magnificent old man, drove up and take a

position on the outside of the crowd, a beautiful young lady was sitting on the box seat, whilst Fred Douglass and her mother retliiiod iusidi!, and the owner of the carriagi,' acted a.s drivt-r. (laughter, cheers, erias of .rightit'wl>* iia.y yon t sa.y jggaist it;: &0.) I saw this in your own town. ('i-'Wliat,of ! *.!>') All I have to say of it IS this, that if you. Black Republicans, think that the negro ought to be on a social equality with your wives and daughters, and ride in a carriage "with your wife, whilst you drive the team, you have per! i^t right to do'so." (Wood, good, and eheerS) ijliagted wit^,-hflBtiag.aBd cries of white, while.) I am told nBttt one of Fred. Douglass' kinsmen, another rich black negro, is now traveling in this part of the State making .speeches for his friend Lincoln as the champion of black men. (^'Wtoie- Mu, white men," and what have^..eB...;get .^e..#i^i a,gSH_f. U." ., That/sjight.iSMfc) All I have to say on that subject isimat those of you who believe that the negro .sMCur* equal and ought to be pn an equality wifmVou socially, politically, and legally, have a" right to entertain those opinions, and of course will vote for Mr. Lincoln. ^siwawi* ihe nearo,".*j aorAev) I have a word to say on Mr. Lincoln's answer to tho interrogatories contained in my speech at Ottawa, and which he has pretended to reply to here to-day. Mr. Lincoln makes "a great parade of the fact that. I quoted a platform as having been adopted by the Black Republican party at Springfield in 1884, which, it turns out, was adopt- ed at another place. Mr. Lincoln loses sight of the thing itself in his eotasies over the mistake I made in stating the place where it was done. He thinks that that, platform was not adopted on the right "spot." When I put the direct questions to Mr. Lincoln to ascertain whether he now stands pledged to that creed to the unconditional repeal of the fugitive slave law, a refusal to admit any more slave States into the Union even if the people want them, a de- termination to apply the Wiimot Proviso not only to all the territory, we now have, but all that we may hereafter acquire, he reiused to answer, and his followers say, in excuse, that the resolutions upon which I based my interrogatories were not adopted at the ," right spot." piau^iite&.an(i .iap^ause.) Lincoln and his political friends are great on "svoU." -(BsJ^.-i#itor.) In Congress, as a representative of this State, he declared the Mexi- can war to be unjust and infamous, and would not support it, or acknowledge his own country to be right in the contest, because he said that Am- erican blood was not shed on American soil in the "right spot." (;faqisooou.to .Ja*B),) And now he cannot answer the questions I put to him at Ottawa because the resolutions I read were not adopted at the "right spot." It may be possible that I was led into an error as to the ^ot on which the resolutions I then read were pro claimed, but I was not, and am not in error as to the fact of their forming the basis of the creed of tlia Jle|iu'ulicaii piiily win n UjiiL jaily was first orgaiiized. ^J4na>iij. 1 will slate to you tlio evidence I itid, aiul l'poiil wiilch 1 relied for my slatemeil that the resoiiuiious in qiicsioii wore adopted at Spiingfield oh tho otliof Oc- tober, 1864. Allhough I was' aware that such resolutions had been pa^'scd in this di.jtrict, and.nearly all llui; northern Congressional dis.triets and county con- ventions, I had not noticed whether or not (hey had been adopted by any Stale, conveillion. In 1860, ti debiite aro.so in Conorcss bolweei iVlaje>r Thomas L. Harris, of the-Springiield disi-iict, and Mr. Nortoi, of liie Jolict district, on po- lilical matlers connected ndlh our State, inr^8 course of which Major Harris (uoted

those resolutions as having been passed by the first Republican State Convention that ever assembled in Illinois. I knew that Lincoln was so remarkable for his accuracy, inasmuch as he was a very conscientious and sincere man, and I also noticed that Mr. Norton did not question the accuracy of this statement. I therefore took it for granted that it was so, and the other day when I concluded to use the resolutions at Ottawa, I wrote to Charles H. Lanphier, editor of the State Register, at Springfield, calling his attention to them, telling him that I had been informed that Major Harris was lying sick at Springfield, and desiring him to call upon him and ascertain the facts.

i

all the time to adopt measures to have State Mr. Lincoln's speech on the subject of the Declaration of Independence for the abolition of slavery.

all the facts concerning the resolutions, the time and the place where they were adopted. In reply Mr. Lanphier sent me two copies of his paper, which I have here. The first is a copy of the State Register, published at Springfield, Mr. Lincoln's own town, on the 10th of October 1854, only eleven days after the adjournment of the convention, from which I desire to read the following: "In the late discussions in this city, Mr. Lincoln made a speech, to which Judge Douglas replied. In Lincoln's speech he took the broad ground that, according to the Declaration of Independence, the whites and blacks are equal. From this he drew the conclusion, which he several times repeated, that the white man had no right to pass laws for the government of the black man without the negro's consent. This speech of Lincoln's was heard and applauded by all the Abolitionists assembled in Springfield. So soon as Mr. Lincoln was done speaking, Mr. Codding arose and requested that the delegates to the Black Republican convention to which I am going did so, and affirming it as an abolition platform call the platform '.....' a bit. I thought this was a little brown when you heard me.... Lincoln's vote for the Crittenden-Montgomery bill, but since you have backed out from that position and gone back to Abolitionism, you are black and not brown. (Hours of laughter, and a voice, "O, ask him another question.") Gentlemen, I have shown you what your platform was in 1854. You still adhere to it. The same platform was adopted by nearly all the counties where the Black Republican party had a majority in 1854. I wish now to call your attention. When I quoted the resolutions at Ottawa and the action of your representatives in the legislature. Mr. Lincoln in relation to them, he said Legislature when they assembled together at Iraw into the Senate 'emancipation. they laid down this as the platform on which they stand. Attention of all our readers to it." .. - Then follows the identical platform, word for word, which I read at Ottawa. (Heard) Now, that was published in Mr. Lincoln's own town, eleven days after the convention was held, and it has remained on record up to this day never contradicted except that his name was on the committee that reported then, but he did not serve, nor did he think he served, because

be was, or thought he was, in Tazewell county at the time the convention was in session. He did not deny that the resolutions were passed by the Springfield convention. He did not know better, and evidently thought that they were, but afterwards his friends declared that they had discovered that they varied in some respects from the resolutions passed by that convention, I have shown you that I had good evidence for believing that the resolutions had been passed at Springfield. Mr. Lincoln ought to have known better; but not a word is said about his ignorance on the subject, whilst notwithstanding the circumstances, am accused of forgery. Now, I will show you that if I have made a mistake as to the place where these resolutions were adopted and when I get down to Springfield I will investigate the matter and see whether or not I have that the principles they enunciate were adopted as the Black Republican platform (white, white,) in the various counties and Congressional Districts throughout the north end of the State in 1854. His platform was adopted in nearly every county that gave a Black Republican majority for the Legislature in that year, and here is a man (pointing to Mr. Denio, who sat on the stand near Beacon Cross,) who knows as well as any living man that it was the creed of the Black Republican party at that time. I would be willing to call Denio as a witness, or any other honest man belonging to that party. I will now read the resolutions adopted at the Rockford Convention on the 30th of August, 1854, which nominated Washburne for Congress. You elected him on the following platform: Resolved, That the continued and increasing aggressions of slavery in our country are destructive of the best rights of a free people, and that such aggressions can not be successfully resisted without the united political action of all good men. Resolved, That the citizens of the United States hold in their hands peaceful, constitutional, and efficient remedy against the encroachments of the slave power, the ballot box, and, if that remedy is boldly and wisely applied, the principles of liberty and eternal justice will be established. Resolved That we accept this issue forced upon us by the slave power, and, in defense of freedom, will cooperate and be known as Republicans, pledged to the accomplishment of the following purposes: ... To bring the Administration of the Government back to the control of first principles; to restore Kansas and Nebraska to the position of free Territories; to repeal and entirely abrogate the fugitive slave law; to restrict slavery to those States in which it exists; to prohibit the admission of any more slave States into the Union; to exclude slavery from all the territories over which the general government has exclusive jurisdiction, and to resist the acquisition of any more territories unless the introduction of slavery therein forever shall have been prohibited. ... , Resolved. That in furtherance of these principles we will use such constitutional and lawful means as shall seem best adapted to their accomplishment, and that we will support no man for office under the General or State Government who is not positively committed to the support of these principles and whose personal character and conduct is not a guaranty that he is reliable and shall abjure all party allegiance and ties. ... , Resolved, That we cordially invite persons of all former political parties whatever in favor of the object expressed in the above resolutions to unite with us in carrying them into effect. J. Swanton D. Nugent was frequently interrupted in his speech.

of "flood, good,"--.'-that's.the dctmej" .aud'-T-eeiferoas ap- llat'" Well, you think that is a very good platform, do you not J (-"Yplj J'") V 'lyttjY!4.aj>A..limj!li..i If you do, if you approve it now, and think it is all i right, you will not join with those men who say that I libel you by calling these your principles, will you? (ikflood,'good, hit hi.i.,agftij>," _aB4..JB*t I IIBtHilLjlt.^' etn!a,) Now, Mr. Lincoln com platnsTmr. Lincoln charges that I did you and him injustice bv saving that this was the platform of your party. pUwWBitdteSftefK) 1 am told that Washburne made a speech in Galena last night in which he abused me awfully for bringing to light this platform on which be was elected to Congress. He thought that yon had forgotten it, as he and Mr. Lincoln desires to. -^mm^^tiim) He did not deny but that you had adopted it, and that he had sub- scribed to and was pledged to it, but he did not think it was fair to call it up and remind the people that it was their platform. But 1 am glad to find that you are more honest in your abolitionism than you leaders, by avowing that it is your platform, and right in your opinion. In the adoption of that platform, you not only de- clared that you would resist the admission of any more slave States, and woric for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law, but yon pledged yourselves not to vote for any man for State or Federal offlcea who was not committed to these principles. "' " -a^ <i^aa\.....UhserSk^ You were thus com n mitted. Similar resolutions to those were adopted in your county Convention here, and now with your admissions that they are your platform and embody your sentiments now as they did then, what do you think of Mr. Lincoln, your candidate for the U. S. Senate, who is attempting to dodge the responsi- bility of this platform, because it was not adopted in the right spot. ^toiis,..lftgbieBrl'"a^ alMdjiij)-.*c:^ I thought that it, was adoptect in Springtfefld, but it turns out it was not, that it was adopted at Rockford and in the various counties which comprise this Congressional District, When I get into the next district, 1 will show that the same platform was adopted there, and so on through the State, until 1 nail the responsibility of it upon the back of the Black Republican party throughout the State, (ii,m^^-^>*vft~^t*-'^^ej^^-^^ lj^Hrrln.ii) * (Avoice Couldn't you modify and call it brown. -iiansTilW,"! Springfield. In the first place you must remember that this was the organization of a new party. It is so declared in the resolutions themselves which say that you are going to dissolve all old party ties and call the new party Republican. The old Whig party was to have its throat cut from ear to ear, and the Democratic party was to be annihilated and blotted out of existence, whilst in lieu of these parties the Black Republican party was to be or ganized on this Abolition platform. You know who the chief leaders were in breaking up and de- stroying these two great parties. Lincoln on the one hand and Trumbull on the other, being disap pointed politicians, (laughter,) and having retired or been driven to obscurity by an outraged constitu- ency because of their political sins, formed a scheme to abolitionize. the two parties and lead the Old Line Whigs and Old Line Democrats captive, bound hand and foot into f he Abolition camp, Giddings, Chase, Fred Douglass and Lovejoy were here to christen them whenever they were brought in. (lHt 'llighli'- } Lincoln went to work to dhssolve the Old Line Whig party. Clay was dead, and although the sod was not yet green on his grave, this man undertook to bring into disrepute those great com promise measures of 1850, with



which Clay and Webster were identified. Up to 1854 the old Whig party and the Democratic party had stood on a common platform so far as this slavery question was concerned. You Whigs and we Democrats differed about the bank, the tariff, distribution, the specie circular and the sub-treasury, but we agreed on this slavery question and the true mode of preserving the peace and harmony of the Union. The compromise measures of 1850 were introduced by Clay, were defended by Webster, and supported by Cass, and were approved by Fillmore, and sanctioned by the National men of both parties. They constituted a common plank upon which both Whigs and Democrats stood. In 1852 the Whig party in its last national convention at Baltimore endorsed and approved these measures of Clay, and so did the national convention of the Democratic party held that same year. Thus the old line Whigs and the old line Democrats stood pledged to the great principle of self government, which guarantees to the people of each Territory the right to decide the slavery question for themselves. In 1854 after the death of Clay and Webster, Mr. Lincoln on the part of the Whigs undertook to abolish the Whig party, by dissolving it, transferring the members into the Abolition camp and making them train under Giddings, Fred. Douglass, Lovejoy, Chase, Farnsworth, and other abolition leaders. Trumbull undertook to dissolve the Democratic party by taking old Democrats into the abolition camp. Mr. Lincoln was aided in his efforts by many leading Whigs throughout the State. Your member of Congress, Mr. Washburne, being one of the most active. Trumbull was aided by many renegades from the Democratic party, among whom were John Wentworth, (Mr. Tom Turner and others with whom you are familiar, Mr. Turner, who was one of the moderators, here interposed and said that he had drawn the resolutions which Senator Douglas had read. Mr. Douglas Yes, and Turner says that he drew these resolutions. That is right, give Turner cheers for drawing the resolutions if you approve them. If he drew those resolutions he will not deny that they are the creed of the Black Republican party. Mr. Turner. They are our creed exactly. And yet Lincoln denies that he stands on them. (Mr. Turner says that the creed of the Black Republican party is the admission of no more slave States, and yet Mr. Lincoln declares, that he would not like to be placed in a position where he would have to vote for them. All I have to say to friend Lincoln is, that I do not think there is much danger of his being placed in such a position. As Sir. Lincoln would be very sorry to be placed in such an embarrassing position as to be obliged to vote on the admission of any more slave States, I propose, out of mere kindness, to relieve him from any such necessity. I the bargain between Lincoln and Trumbull for abolishing the Whig and Democratic parties, they "spread" over the State, Lincoln still pretending to be an Old Line Whig in order to "rope in" the Whigs, and Trumbull pretending to be as good a Democrat as he ever was in order to coax the Democrats over into the Abolition ranks. They played the part that "decoy ducks" play down the Pottomac river. In that part of the country they make artificial ducks and put them on the water in places where the wild ducks are to be found for the purpose of decoying them. Well, Lincoln

and Trumbull played the part of these "decoy ducks" and deceived enough Old Line Whigs and Old Line Democrats to elect a Black Republican Legislature. When that Legislature met, the first thing it did was to elect as Speaker of the House the very man who is now boasting that_ he wrote the (Abolition platform on which Lincoln must not stand. ('T'ft<itl|di"..".hlt, hi!B-agai", ""--*nl oiiaefS,) I want to know of .Vlr, Turner whether or not, when he was elected. he was a good em- Lodinient of Republican principles? Mr. Turner I hope I was then and am now. Mr. Utmglas He answers that he hopes he was then and is now. He wrote that Black Republican platform, and is satisfied with it now, (^iaw*. -jasjXnast^-^^i^i" &&) I admire and acknowledge Turner's Donesty, Everyman of you know that what he says about these resolutions being the H *

I 1 i

i i;

MfefsSi ? .1 pialfuiru of theBUck Republican, f,^., ,> ,,, ub, huo you also know that each one of these men who are subfling and trying to deny it are only trying to defeat the people out of their votes for "the purpose of deceiving them still more after the election. (?rr>n >HijHlialwiarn) I propose to trace this thing a little further, in order that you can see what additional evidence, there is to fasten this revolutionary platform upon the Black Republican party. When the Legislature assembled, there was an United States Senator to elect in the place of G-ea. Shields, and before that proceeded to ballot, Lovejoy insisted on laying down certain principles by which to govern the party. It has been published to the world and satisfactorily proven that there was at the time the alliance was made between TrumbuU and Lincoln to abolitionize the two parties, an agreement that Lincoln should take Shields' place in the United States Senate, and TrumbuU should have mine so soon as they could conveniently get rid of me. When Lincoln was beaten for Shields' place in a manner I will refer to in a few minutes, he felt very sore and restive ; his friends grumbled, and some of them came out and charged that the most infamous treachery had been practised against him; that the bargain was that Lincoln was to have had Shields' place, and TrumbuU was to have waited for mine, but that TrumbuU having the control of a few abolitionized Democrats, he prevented them from voting for Lincoln, thus keeping him within a few votes of an election until he succeeded in forcing the party to drop him and elect TrumbuU. Well, TrumbuU having cheated Lincoln, his friends made a fuss, and in order to keep them and Lincoln quiet, the party were obliged to come forward, in advance, at the last State election, and make a pledge that they would go for Lincoln and nobody else. Lincoln could not be silenced in any other way. / Now, there are a great many Black Republicans of you who do not know this thing was done. (AiAi*ei-wieJAtM4|fi>et clamor.) I wish to remind you that while Mr. Lincoln was speaking there was not a Democrat vulgar and black-guard enough to interrupt him. ^Gteat-2pplaos(Wt'i!B-o(4nifo jali for DonglfHSf) But I know

that the shoe is pinching you. I am clinching Lincoln now and you are scared to death for the result, (I have seen this thing before. I have seen men make appointments for joint discussions, and the moment their man has been heard, try to interrupt and prevent a fair hearing of the other side. I have seen your mobs before, and defy your wrath. (Vermont -taendous applause..) My friends, do not cheer, for I need my whole time. The object of the opposition is to occupy my attention in order to prevent me from giving the whole evidence and nail this double dealing on the Black Republican party. As I have before said, Lovejoy demanded a declaration of principles on the part of the Black Republicans of the Legislature before going into an election for United States Senator. He offered the following preamble and resolutions which I hold in my hand : , . Whereas, human slavery is a violation of the principles of natural and revealed rights; and whereas, the fathers of the Revolution, fully imbued with the spirit of these principles, declared freedom to be the inalienable birthright of all men; and whereas, the preamble to the Constitution of the United States avers that that instrument was ordained to establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity; and whereas, in furtherance of the above principles, slavery was forever prohibited in the old north-west territory, and more recently in all that territory lying west and north of the State of Missouri, by the act of the federal government; and whereas, the repeal or the prohibition, last referred to, is contrary to the wishes of the people of Illinois, a violation of an implied compact, long deemed and held sacred by the citizens of the United States. and a wide departure from the uniform action of the general government in relation to the extension of slavery; therefore, Resolved. That the House of Representatives, the Senate concur; therein, That our senators in Congress be instructed. and our Representatives requested to introduce, if not otherwise introduced, and to vote for a bill to restore such prohibition to the aforesaid territories, and also to extend a similar prohibition to all territory which now belongs to the United States, or which may hereafter come under their jurisdiction. Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to vote against the admission of any State into the Union, the constitution of which does not prohibit slavery, whether the territory out of which such State may have been formed shall have been acquired by conquest, treaty, purchase, or from original territory of the United States. Resolved. That our Senators in Congress be instructed. and our Representatives requested to introduce and vote for a bill to repeal an act entitled "an act respecting fugitives from service and persons escaping from the service of their masters; and, tilling in that, for such a modification of it as shall secure the right of habeas corpus and trial by jury before the regularly-constituted authorities of the State, to all persons claimed as owing service or labor. 4B'i<o*'***'Sadir'iiii!<ijedfe.Bi.chefg<), Yes, yon ^Bay'*-gotret.'^'"gooti,^*-B4-j-%av?no '-dotrbt-you jifaMiiMHk Those resolutions were introduced by Mr. Covejoy immediately preceding the election of Senator. They declared first, that the Wilmot Proviso must be applied to all territory North of 86 deg, 30 min. Secondly that it must be applied to all territory South of 86 deg., 80 min. Thirdly, that it must be applied to all the territory now owned by the United States, and finally, that it must be

applied to all territory here- after to be acquired by the United States. The next resolution declares that no more slave States shall be admitted into this Union under any cir- cumstances whatever, no matter whether they are formed out of territory now owned by us or' that we may hereafter acquire, by treaty, by Congress, or in any manner whatever. (A-*i<)<>~<'That is 6ja.gt*ts"^\r. .Sniia. eay.thutis xi^U Wewili^e iu Ht.vaB*^^*- The next resolution demands the uncon- ditional repeal of the fugitive slave law, although its unconditional repeal would leave no provision for carrying out that clause of the Constitution of the United States which guarantees the surrender of fugitives. If they could not get an uncon- ditional repeal, they demanded that that law should be so modified as to make it as nearly useless as possibl'. Now I want to show you who voted for these resolutions. When the vote was taken on the first resolution it was decided in the affirmative yeas 41, nays 82. You will find that this it a strict party vote, between the Democrats, on the one hand, and the Black Republicans, on the other. (tilue,ii uf litfWttitey'.xn.dlamor.)~ I know your name, and always call things by their right name. The point I wish to call your attention to, is this: that these resolutions were adopted on the 7th day of Febru- ary, and that on the 8th they went into an election for a U. S. Senator, and on that day every man who voted for these resolutions, with but t^o excep- tions, voted for Lincoln for the U. S. Senate. (SriSS, ijd," and '* give us their names.") I will read the uairies over to you if you want them, but I believe your object is to occupy my time. ("^JRB.nt' "tbi.i^>t,;") On the next resolution, the vote stood yeas 38, nays 40, and on the third resolution ^yeas 35, nays 4:7. I wish to impress it upon you, that every man who voted for those resolutions, with but two excep- tions, voted on the next day for Lincoln, for U. S. Senator, iiear in mind that the members who thus voted for Lincoln were elected to the Legisla- ture, pledged to vote for no man for office under the State or federal government who was not com- mitted to this Black Republican platform, (lime at4*iwbiw)i)"atfite;'nmt'-'ttaidia-^t") They were ail so pledged. Mr. Turner, who stands by me, and who then represented you, and who say's that he wrote those resolutions, voted for Lincoln, when he was pledged not to do so unless Lincoln was committed in favor of those resolutions. I no* ask Mr. Turner, (turning to Turner) did you violate your pledge in voting for Mr. Lincoln, or did be commit himself to your platform before you cast your vote for him. -^Sitv-fettwein-Jier*. MaEtod 4j>rward, and ^raapiB^M^Taji<, ehok him^^r- TOusly, and said, "don't Miwer,-4'mw,""ytw-'ba,K ino right to answer.") f could go through the whole list of names here and show you that all the Black Republicans in the Legislature, C^J8tit%-'^**'-'') who voted for Mr. Lincoln, had voted on the day pre vious for these resolutions. For instance, here are the names of Sargent and Little of Jo Daviess and Carroll; Thomas J. Turner, of Stephenson; Law- rence, of Boonc and McHenry; Swan, of Lake; Pinckney, of Ogle county, and Lyman, of Winne- bago. 'Thus you see every member from your Con- gressioual D.strict voted for Mr. Lincoln, and they were pledged not to vote for him unless he was com- mitted tn the doctrine of no more slave Statss, the prohibition of slavery in the Territories, and the re- peal of the Fugitive Slave law. Mr. Lincoln tells you to-day that he is not pledged to any such doc- trine. Either Mr. Lincoln was then committed to those propositions, or Mr. Turner

violated his pledges to you when he voted for him. ^Either Lin- coln was pledged to each one of those propositions, or else every Black Republican^^^iafiifo4.^ywb4e, aijl^ representative from this Congressional District violated his pledge of honor to his con stituents by voting for him. I ask you which horn of the dilemma will you take? Will you hold Lincoln up to the platform of his party, or will you accuse every rep- resentative you had in the Legislature of vio- lating his pledge of honor to his constituents. (ACijieesj '-'-we go fior IWner,'-' '.wego for LiBBOIB;" l^hurrah for Coijgtas,". " burrah for T'urrier." TH^Is^iio escape for you. Either Mr. Lincoln was committed to those propositions, or your mem- bers Violated their faith. Take either horn of the dilemma you choose. There is no dodging the question, 1 want Lincoln's answer. He says he was not pledged to repeal the fugitive slave law, that he does not quite like to do it; he will not introduce a law to repeal it, but thinks there ought to be some law; he does not tell what it ought to be; upon the whole, he is altogether undecided, and, don't know what to think or to do. That is the substaace of his answer upon the repeal of the fugitive slave law. I put the question to him distinctly, whether he endorsed that part of the Black Republican plat- form which calls for the entire abrogation and re- peal of the fugitive slave law. He answers no! that he does not endorse that, but he does not tell what he is for, or what he will vote for. His an- swer is, in fact, no answer at all. Why cannot he speak out and say what he is for and what he will do? (QaiiiftjatMiaht'!)girt.") In regard to there being no more slave States, he is not pledged to that. He would not like, he says, to be put in a position where he would have to vote one way or another upon that question. I pray you do not put him in a position that would embarrass him so much. (Innugfator.) Gentlemen, if he goes to the Senate, he may be put in that po sition, and then which way will he vote ? A voice How will you vote ? Mr. Douglas I will vote for the admission of just such a State as by the form of their Constitu- tion the people show they want; "if they want slave- ry, they shall have it; if they prohibit slavery, it shall be prohibited. They can form their institu- tions to please themselves, subject only to the Con- stitution ; and I for one stand ready to receive them info the Union. (ifcStcEEa_c.heex3 for DouglftSi") Why cannot your Black Republican candidates talk out as plain as that when they are questioned? (l lRjBS ,nf-i.go(idf.j^odL." rfl);e Deacon Bross spake. 1 do not wan t to cheat any man out of his vote. No man is deceived in regard to my principles if I have the power to express myself in terms explicit enough to convey mv ideas. Mr. Lincoln made a speech when he was nomi- nated for the U. S. Senate which covers all these abolition platforms. He there lays down a propo- sition so broad in its abolitionism as to cover the whole ground. " In my opinion it (the slavery agitation) will not' ease un- til a crisis shall have been reached end passer!. "Ah userli. vided .^against itself cannot stand," I believe this Government cannot endure pel manentlyhalfSlaveandha.lf Free. Ido not expect the bouse to tall but I do expect it will cease tn bedi. vifted. It willbecomeall oye hing orail theother. Eitherihe oiipfmenrs of Slavery will arrest the further spr-.ad of ii. and pace it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that It 13 in the course of ultimate ext-nction or its advocates wiU push i. forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States old as well as new, North as well as South." There you find that Mr. Lincoln lays down the

doctrine that this Union cannot endure divided as our Fathers made it, with free and slave States. . He says they must all become one thing, or all the other; that they must be all free or all slave, or else the Union cannot continue to exist. It being his opinion that to admit anymore slave States, to continue to divide the Union into free and slave States, will dissolve it. I want to know of Mr. Lincoln whether he will vote for the admission of another Slave state. (<5rJee--04-. "iJriBg mia.^aut") He tells you the Union cannot exist unless the States are all free or all slave; he tells you that he is opposed to making them all slave, and hence he is for making them all free, in order that the Union may exist; and y-1 he will not say that he will not vote against the admission of another slave State, knowing that the Union must be dis- tt-l

-s*^<*: ^ „K^ solved if he votes for it. ^sirstt^t-iftK^Mer.) last! you if that is fair dealing ? The true intent and in- evitable conclusion to be drawn from his first Springfield speech is, that he is opposed to the ,admission of any more slave States under any circumstance. If he is so opposed why not say so ? If he believes this Union cannot endure divided into free and slave States, that they must all become free in order to save the 'Union, he is bound, as an honest man, to vote against any more slave States. If he believes it he is bound to do it. StioW me that it is my duty in order to save the Union to do a particular act, and I will do it if the constitution does not prohibit it. (^4 nplniinr) I am not for the dissolution of the Union nnder any circumstances. (Renewed applause.) I will pursue no course of conduct that will give just cause for the dissolution of the Union. The hope of the freinds oi freedom throughout the world rests upon the perpetuity of this Union. The down-trodden and oppressed people who are suffering under European despotism all look with hope and anxiety to the American Union as the only resting place and permanent home of freedom and self government. Mr. Lincoln says that he believes that this Union 'cannot continue to endure with slave States in it, and yet he will not tell you distinctly whether he will vote for or against the admission of any more slave States, but says he would not like to be putto the test.' (lji>M | ililmi.) I do not think he will be put to the test. (BanBiad, litngbter-.) I do not think that the people of Illinois desire a man to represent them who would not like to be put to the test on the performance of a high constitutional duty (rtBSTrf-gead.) I will retire in shame from the Senate of the United States when I am not willing to be put to the test in the performance " y duiy. I have, been put to se- vere tests. (lraitimn^^ I have stood by my prin- ciples iu fair weather and in foul, in the sunshine and in the rain. I have defended the great princi- ples of self government here among you when Northern sentiment ran in a torrent against me. (4^ fl^(fl;fi | ^T!s*o?) and 1 have defended that same great principle when Southern sentiment came down like an avalanche upon me. I was not afraid of any test they put to me. I knew I was ri^ht I knew my principles were sound I knew that the people would see^in the end that I had done right, and I knew that the God of Heaven would smile upon me if I was faithful in the performance of my duty, (fjiieo of goo4 | -ebeww.ABd>laghtc.) Mr. Lincoln makes a charge of corruption against

the Supreme Court of the United States, and two Presidents of the United States, and attempts to bolster it up by saying that I did the same against the Washington Union. Suppose I did make that charge of corruption against the Washington Union, when it was true, does that justify him in making a false charge against me and others? That is the question I would put. He says that at the time the Nebraska bill was introduced, and before it was passed there was a conspiracy between the Judges of the Supreme Court, President Pierce, President Buchanan and myself by that bill, and the decision of the Court to break down the barrier and establish slavery all over the Union. Doubts he not know that that charge is historically false as against President Buchanan? He knows that Mr. Buchanan was at that time in England, representing this country with distinguished ability at the Court of St. James, that he was there for a long time before and did not return for a year or so afterwards. He knows that to be true, and that fact proves his charge to be false as against Mr. Buchanan. (Ibid.) Then again, I wish to call his attention to the fact that at the time the Nebraska bill was passed the Dred Scott case was not before the Supreme Court at all; it was not upon the docket of the Supreme Court; it had not been brought there, and the Judges in all probability, knew nothing of it. Thus the history of the country proves the charge to be false as I against them. As to President Pierce, his high character as a man of integrity and honor is enough to vindicate him from such a charge, (I judge) and as to myself, I pronounce the charge an infamous lie, whenever and wherever made, and by whomsoever made. I am willing that Mr. Lincoln should go and rake up every public act of mine, every measure I have introduced, report I have made, speech delivered, and criticise them, but when he charges upon me a corrupt conspiracy for the purpose of perverting the institutions of the country, I brand it as it deserves. I say the history of the country proves it to be false, and that it could not have been possible at the time. But now he tries to protect himself in this charge, because I made a charge against the Washington Union. My speech in the Senate against the Washington Union was made because it advocated a revolutionary doctrine, by declaring that the free States had not the right to prohibit slavery within their own limits. Because I made that charge against the Washington Union, Mr. Lincoln says it was a charge against Mr. Buchanan. Suppose it was; is Mr. Lincoln the peculiar defender of Mr. Buchanan? Is he so interested in the federal administration, and so bound to it that he must jump to the rescue and defend it from every attack that I may make against it? (Great applause and cheers.) I understand the whole thing. The Washington Union, under that most corrupt of all men, Cornelius Wendell, is advocating Mr. Lincoln's claim to the Senate. Wendell was the printer of the last Black Republican House of Representatives; he was a candidate before the present Democratic House, but was ignominiously kicked out, and then he took the money which he had made out of the public printing by means of the Black Republicans, bought the Washington Union, and is now publishing it in the name of the Democratic party, and advocating Mr. Lincoln's election to the Senate. Mr. Lincoln therefore considers any attack upon Wendell and his corrupt gang as a personal attack upon him. (Great applause and cheering.) This only proves what I have charged, that there is an alliance between Lincoln and his supporters and the federal

office-holders of this State", and Presidential aspirants out of it, to break me down at home, ____
 I feel that Lincoln feels bound to come in to the rescue of the
 Washington Union. In that speech which I delivered in answer to the Washington Union, I made it
 distinctly against the Union, and against the Union alone. I do not choose to go beyond that. You have
 occasion to attack the President's conduct, I will do it in language that will not be misunderstood.
 When I differed with the President I spoke out. That you all heard me. (4*it ^i did, . aad-ht, .*)
 That question passed away; It resulted in the triumph of my principle by allowing the people to do as
 they please, and there is an end of the controversy. (4*it ^i did, . aad-ht, .*) When ever the great principle of
 self-government the right of the people to make their own Constitution, as, a come into the Union with
 with slavery, or without it, as they see proper shall again arise, you will find me standing firm in de-
 fence of that principle, and fighting whoever fights it for. (4*it ^i did, . aad-ht, .*) It
 Mr Buchanan stands, as I doubt not he will, by the recommendation contained in his message, that
 hereafter all State constitutions ought to be submitted to the people before the admission of the
 State into the Union, he will find me standing by him firmly, shoulder to shoulder, in carrying it out
 I know Mr. Lincoln's object, he wants to divide the Democratic party, in order that he may defeat
 me and get to the Senate. . . , Mr. Douglas' time here expired, and he stopped on the moment. Mr.
 Lincoln's Rejoinder. Aa.tti>bifi6tM-ftia&Uifi.aa4BacteAwittoOCif- My friends, it will readily occur
 to you that I cannot in half an hour notice all the things that no able a man as Judge Douglas can
 say, in an hour and a half, and I hope, therefore, if there be anything that he has said upon which
 you would like to hear something from me, but which I omit to comment upon, you will bear in
 mind that it would be expecting an impossibility for me to go over his whole ground. I can but
 take up some of the points that he has dwelt upon, and employ my half-hour specially on them. .
 The first thing I have to say to you is a word in regard to Judge Douglas' declaration about the "
 vulgarity and blackguardism" in the audience that no such thing, as he says, was shown by any
 Democrat while I was speaking. Now, I only wish, by way of reply on this subject, to say that while I
 was speaking I used no "vulgarity or blackguardism" towards any Democrat. (4*it ^i did, . aad-ht, .*)
 Now, my friends, I come to all this long portion of the Judge's speech perhaps half of
 it which he has devoted to the various resolutions and platforms that have been adopted in the
 different counties in the different Congressional districts, and in the Illinois Legislature which he
 supposes are at variance with the positions I have assumed before you to-day. It is true that many of
 these resolutions are at variance with the positions I have here assumed. All I have to ask is that
 we talk reasonably and rationally about it. I happen to know, the Judge's opinion to the contrary
 notwithstanding, that I have never tried to conceal my opinions, nor tried to deceive anyone, in
 reference to them. He may go and examine all the members who voted for me for United States
 Senator in 1855, after the election of 1854. They were pledged to certain things here at home, and
 were determined to have pledges from me, and if he will find any of these persons who will tell him
 anything inconsistent with what I say now, I will resign, or rather retire from the race, and give him

no more trouble. The plain truth is this : At the introduction of the Nebraska policy, we believed there was a new era being introduced in the history of the Republic, which tended to the spread and perpetuation of slavery. But in our opposition to that measure we did not agree with one another in everything. The people in the north end of the State were for stronger measures of opposition than we of the central and southern portions of the State, but we were all opposed to the Nebraska doctrine. We had that one feeling and that one sentiment in common. You at the north end met in your Convention, and passed your resolutions. We in the middle of the State and further south did not hold such Conventions and pass the same resolutions, although we had in general a common view and a common sentiment. So that these meetings which the Judge has alluded to, and the resolutions he has veered from were local and did not spread over the whole State. We at last met together in 1856 from all parts of the State, and we agreed upon a common platform. You, who held more extreme notions either yielded those notions, or if not wholly yielding them, agreed to yield them practically, for the sake of embodying the opposition to the measures which the opposite party were pushing forward at that time. We met you then, and if there was anything yielded, it was for practical purposes. We agreed then upon a platform for the party throughout the entire State of Illinois, and now we are all bound as a party, to that platform. And I say here to you, if any one expects of me in the case of my election that I will do anything not signified by our Republican platform and my answers here to-day, I tell you very frankly that person will be deceived. I do not ask for the vote of any one, who supposes that I have secret purposes or pledges that I dare not speak out. Cannot the Judge be satisfied ? If he fears in the unfortunate case of my election, that my going to Washington will enable me to advocate sentiments contrary to those which I expressed when you voted for and elected me, I assure him that his fears are wholly needless and groundless. Is the Judge really afraid of any such thing? I'll tell you what he is afraid of. He is afraid we'll all pull together, and we will, we will. This is what alarms him more than anything else. For my part, I do hope that all of us, entertaining a common sentiment in opposition to what appears to us a design to nationalize and perpetuate slavery, will waive minor differences on questions which

"*^W

I" I n ij;sl,.-;*D??aw"

I either belong to the dead past or the future, and all pull together in this struggle. What are your sentiments? Just as we are - together. And I am determined. If it be true, that on the ground which I occupy ground which I occupy as frankly and boldly as Judge Douglas does his my views, though partly coinciding with yours, are not as perfectly in accordance with your feelings as his are, I do say to you in all candor. Go for him and not for me. I hope to deal in all things fairly with Judge Douglas,

and with the people of the State, in this contest. And if I should never be elected to any office, I trust I may go down with no stain of falsehood upon my reputation,-notwithstanding the hard opinions Judge Douglas chooses to entertain of me. 'Trial' The Judge MB again addressed himself to the abolition tendencies of a speech of mine, made at Springfield in June last. I have so often tried to answer what he is always saying on that melancholy theme, that I almost turn with disgust from the dismission from the repetition of an answer to it. I trust that nearly all of this intelligent audience have read that speech. "Waiiiii 'niti 4lts^.' If you have, I may venture to leave it to you to inspect it closely, and see whether it contains any of those "bugaboos" which frighten Judge Douglas. JT'ifiinfjlitfr The Judge complains that I did not fully answer his questions. If I have the sense to comprehend and answer those questions, I have done so fairly. If it can be pointed out to me how I can more fully and fairly answer him, I aver I have not the sense to see how it's to be done. He says I do not declare I would in any event vote for the admission of a slave State into the Union. If I have been fairly reported he will see that I did give an explicit answer to his interrogatories, I did not merely say that I would dislike to be put to the test; but I said clearly, if I were put to the test, and a Territory from which slavery had been excluded should present herself with a State Constitution sanctioning slavery-a most extraordinary thing and wholly unlikely ever to happen I did not see how I could avoid voting for her admission. But he refuses to understand that I said so, and he wants this audience to understand that I did not say so. Yet it will be so reported in the printed speech that he cannot help seeing it. He says if I should vote for the admission of a Slave State I would be voting for a dissolution of the Union, because I hold that the Union can not permanently exist half slave and half free. I repeat that I do not believe this Government can endure permanently half slave and half free, yet I do not admit, nor does it at all follow, that the admission of a single Slave State will permanently change the character and establish this as a universal slave nation. The Judge is very happy indeed at working up these quibbles. fLau^te.adheia.J Before leaving the subject of answering questions I aver as my confident belief, when you come to see our speeches in print, that you will find every question which he has asked me more fairly and boldly and fully answered than he has answered those which I put to him. Is not that so? True-of-yes, -jnu, The two speeches may be placed side by side; and I will venture to leave it to impartial judges whether his questions have not been more directly and circumstantially answered than mine. ' Judge Douglas says he made a charge upon the editor of the Washington Union., alone, of entertaining a purpose to rob the States of their power to exclude slavery from their limits. I undertake to say, and I make the direct issue, that he did not make his charge against the editor of the Union alone. (jj.pjjae3 I will undertake to prove by the record here, that he made that charge against more and higher dignitaries than the editor of the Washington Union. I am quite aware that he was shirking and dodging around the form in which he put it, but I can make it manifest that he leveled his "fatal blow" against more persons than this Washington editor. Will he \ dodge it now by alleging that I am trying to defend Mr. Buchanan against the charge? Not at all, Am I not making the same charge myself? I {h'mflklov

imDiOft|to*w'. I am trying to show that you, Judge Douglas, are a witness on my side.' lisoewwid
Laoi^Utaft^ 1 am not defend- ing iuchanan, and 1 will tell Judge Douglas that in m.y opinion, when
he made that charge, he had an eye farther North than he was to-day. He was then lighting against
people who called him a Black Republican and an Abolitionist. It is mixed all through his speech, and
it is tolera- bly manifest that his eye was a great deal far- ther North than it is to-day. LyteBMU<ll-
t,^~ The Judge says that though he made this charge Toombs got up and declared there was not
a man iu the United States except tho editor of the Union, who was in favor of the Qoctrines put
foiT_i in that article. And thereupon, I understand that the Judge with- drew the charge. Although
he had taken ex- tracts from the newspaper, and then from the Le- compton Constitution, to show
the existence of a conspiracy to bring about a "fatal hlow," hy which the States were to be depuved
of the right of excluding slavery, it aU went to pot as soon as Toombs got op and told him it was
not true. tyaigt^PT^ It reminds me of the st ury that John PhcemxTthe California railroad surveyor,
tells. He says they st .tied out frojri tlie Plaza to the Mission of Dolores, They lad two ways of deter-
mininn- distances. One was by a eham and pins takenwer the giouad. The other was by a " go- it-
ometer" an invention of h-s own a threes le'^ed instrument, w'Ah wI Th he computed a serfes of
triangles ljetvyeen v"ie poiits. At iight he turned to the chaio-man to ?scertainwhat distance they had
come, aud found that by some mistake he had merely dragged the oh Jn over th?- ground without
keeping any record. By thj^, " go-it-ometer" he found he had made ten miles. Being skeptical about
this, he asked a drayman who was passing how far it was to the plaza. The drayman replied it was
just half a mile, and the surveyor put it down ia his book just as J ude Douglas says, alter he had
wade hia cal- culations and computatiQaa, he took Toombs' .-iatemeut. filter. I have no doubt that
after Juge joiigias had made his charge, he was as easily satisfied about its truth as the surveyor was
of the drayman's statement of the distance to the plasa. Renewed laughter. Yet it is a faot that the
man who put forth all that matter which Douglas deemed a "fatal blow" at State sovereigaty, was
elected by the Democrats as public printer, Now, gentlemen, you may take Judge Doug- las' speech
ot March 22d, 1858, beginning about the middle of page 21, aud reading to the bot- tom of page 24,
and you will find the evidence on which I say that he did not make his charge against the editor of
the Union alone. I cannot stop to read it, but I will give it to the report- ers. J ude Douglas said: Mr:
President, you here (indseveral distinct propositions advanced bold > by I lie W^a=iiingLon Union
adiorm'ly ajxd apiiaieotlv aiithoritatively, and every man "who ques- tiois any of liiem is di^n.^ui.ced
as an Abolili .nist, a Free- Soiler, a fanatic. The propositions are, first, tliat the pri- mary objeet if
all government at its original tnst.tutiou is the protection of per onsand property; second, tliat the
econstitution of the United Statts djclaresthat the citizens of each State shall be entitled to alt the
privileges andim- mnnities of citiKensIn tjie several States ; and that, ihere- I twe, thirdly, all Stats
tows, witetuer orgaoig or oHierwi89. it j-HY-h'bst tba etti^sena Af oiie Stat* fpom smlttjiB lii ii 1- tviii
tielr slave property, aud ospeelaily deelafnt;' - ' - ' tviolali-ns oftbe olginal intifn;= - '^ it to oi tho
tjoverument and Constitution of the United Staie^~ aodfourtb, tiiatthe em*ficipaiionof theslavesof

then'rth- ern States was a gro s outrage on tt;e riglits of property ina> much as it was involun-.aiily done on the part ot the owner. Remember that thi? article -was published in the XjnlMi on the ITtli of November, a-^d on the 18t,h appeared 'lie first article giving the adhesion of the Unio^l to the Lecompton Constitution, It was in these wcrds: "Kansas and u^u Constituti-.n. The vexed question is settled. The problem is solved. The dread point of danger is rassf-d- All serious trouble to Kansas affairs is over and gone" And a column, nearly, of the came sort. Then, whenyon come to look in o the Lecompton Constitution, you find ijf^ the same doctrine incorporated in it which was put foitli '^ editorially in the Z7mo?i. What is it? ^ " Article 7, Section 1. The right of property is before and lrglier than any constitutional sanction; and the right of the owner of a slave to suohsl^ve and its Increase is the same and as inviiable as the right of the owner of any property whatever." Thenin the schedule is a provision that the Constitu- tion may be amended after 1861 by a two-thirds v^,te. "Eut no alteration shall be made to aHect the right of property iu the ownership of slaves." It will be seen by those clauses in the Lecompton Con- stitution t': at they are identical Inspirit with this author- itative aHicle in the Washing on Union of the day pre- vious to its indorsement of tills Constitmi.n. " When I saw that article in the Union of tho 17th of November, loliowedby theg orificathiu of the Lecornp- ton Constitution on lhe 18th of November- and ,thli clause In the Constitution asscriing the doctrine th^t a Sta'ehasnori httoprobibi slavtry within its 1 mits, I sawthattbera was a/ia2 hlow being struck at the sov- ereignty Oi the S'ates of this Ui ion. Here he says, "Mr. President, you here find several dis.iact propositions advanced boldly, and apparently authoritatively." By whose authptity. Judge Douglas? ftujat-eheftw-aiHl"teaipSel-. Again, he says in another place, " It will be seen by these clauses in the Lecompton Constitution, that they are identical in Spirit with this authori- ta^iw article." Sy whose authority? fji/jMS^^ .laiinfllil Who do you mean to say authorized the publication of these articles ? lie knows that the Washington Union is considered the organ of the Administration. / demand of Judge Douglas by whose autliority he meant to say those rti- cles were published, if not by the authority"^^the President of the United States and his Cabinet ? I defy him to show whom he rcfttrred to, if not to these high funGtionaiies in the Federal Govern- ment. More than this, he says the articles in-that paper and the provisions of the Lecompton Con- stitution ara ""identical," and being ideotical, he argues that the authors are co-operating and con- spiring together. He does not use the word "conspiring," but what other construction can you put upon it ? He winds up with this : " When I saw that article in the Union of the 17th of November, followed by the glorification of the Lecompton Constitution on the 18th of November, and this clause in the Constitution asserting tr,e doctrine th t a State has no right to prohibit sUvery within Its limits I saw thst there was & Altai hlow being struck at the sov erelgnty of the States of this Union." I ask him if all this fuss was made over the editor of this newspaper. jt*a^^Ui>!^ It would be a terribly "fatal blow" in- indeed which a single man could strike, when no President, no Cabinet officer, no member of Congress, was giving strength and efficiency to the movement. Out of respect to Judge Doug- las'good sense I must believe he didn't manu- facture his idea of the " fatal" character of that blow out of such a miserable scapegrace as he

represents that editor to be. But the Judge's eye is farther south now. JJSSBtdiSE^SD"* ohooo. Then, it was very peculiarly and decidedly North. His hope rested on the idea of visiting the great "Black Repub- lican" party, and making . H . the tail of his new kite. |iftBfta1iii.;i,iftjMJbt'y He knows he was then expecting from day to day to turn Republican and place himself at the head of our organization. He has found that these despised "Black Republicans" estimate him by a standard which he has taught them none too well. Hence he is crawling back into his old camp, and you will find him eventually installed in full fellowship among those whom he was then battling, and with whom he now pretends to be at such fearful variance. Loud applause and cries of "goon, go on." J I cannot gentlemen, my time has expired. f %

_' _''^ ^ ^ ^ ^ |i' |

^ .>^

"1 ll m

' *-^K;6@>>: ..^

:^'5,1^

r"; 1^ rj-j-v^.-;; O'QyfiLAS' SPEECH.- , , Ladies ^d 6tTi.BMN: 1 appear before you to- day in pursuance of a preTious notice, and Ka*e made arrangements with Mr. Lincoln to divide time and discuss with him the leading political topic of the country. -; ' ' '. Prior to 1854 this country was divided into two great political parties known as Whig and Demo- cratic. These parties differed from each other on " questions which were then deemed of im- portance to the best interests of the republic. Whigs and Democrats differed about a bank, the distribution, the specie circular and the treasury. On these issues we went before the country and discussed the principles, objects and measures of the two great parties. Each of the parties could proclaim its principles in Louisiana as well as in Massachusetts, in Kentucky as well as in Illinois. At that period, a great revolution has taken place in the formation of parties, by which now seem to be divided by a geographical line, a large party in the North being arrayed under the abolition or republican banner, and the other party, the Southern or Democratic. It becomes important for us to inquire how this transformation of parties has occurred, made from those of national principles to geographical actions. In 1850, this country was agitated from its centre to its circumference about this slavery question, it became necessary for the leaders of the great Whig party and the leaders of the great Democratic party to postpone, for the time being, their particular dis-

jputo^ and'uuito flrst to save the Union before they, should quarrel as to the mode in wbioK it was to, bft 'governed, inuring the Congress of 1849, '50, Henry' iClay was tb leader of the Union m'en, s'upport'ed l by Oas? ajpd Webster and the leaders Of the democ- racy and the;lailers of the Whigs, in opppsition.to lNorj;hsttt alrolitiomsts or. Southern disuiiioniBta. i1;ha't great contest of 1850 resiilted in" the establi'sh- j iflent ot tl)e compromise measures of that yeat, whicjhjneasures rested on the great principle that the people of eaOh State eind each-territory of this Union oiigiit to be permitted to regulate their "oWn domestic inijtutions in thei): own way subjeot'ta, no other, iimit^tioii than that'Jwhioh the Federal Constitution invposes. ' - :-'.- I now wish to ask you whether that principle WM right, or wrong which guaranteed to every State and every community the right; to ;form and. regiilata their domestic institutio'hs to '.suit; fheihselfes.-^ i These measures were adopted, .as l'have .previous- ly sai(j, by the joint iiotion o(the Union W,liigs; and Union Democrats, in opposition to Northern AbolilicnistH and Southern .Disuiiionists'-Jn 1858, l when the 'W'liig parly iissembled at Baltimore, ln i nator,alcanv6ntion tor'the last time, they adopted ij the principle of the Comprom"iso measures of 1850 ' as their rule of party action in .the future. ^ae. month thereafter Cbe Democrats assembled M thB same place to nominate a candidate for.the Presi- dency, and declared the same great pt'incipls.: as t'ne i-ule of Action bt. which the Demociracy would bo gbvorned. 'fhePresidehtial elsotionbf 1852.was fought ou that bisii; It is true- that the Whigs claimed apc&ifti" sier'it tor the adoption of those measures, because they asserted that their great Clay originated them, their God-lite Webster ds- lended them, and their Fillmore signed the bill malriBg tbein the la.w of the land; but on.the oth- er baud" the l>emocrats claimed special oreditfo^ the Demooraov, upon t'ae ground, that we gave twice as many vbtes-vn both Houses of Cougress for tbe passage of lheBB'measui\ as the Whie.pai'ty. -Thus ypn seethatin. tKe Freildehtiar-eleotiop of 185-^ the Whiga were- pledged b'y their platfof.ni and Cheir oaudidalB to (Ue piincipie of the Co.mi)r- mlee'meafiui-es of l'&50, and the .Deinooracy" were likewise (>ledged.'oy our priinciples, our platform, and our candidate; to- the .same'line of pohcy, to preserve peaq'e and.quiet.betwesji.the.diaerent aeo- tlpns of this Cijion. Since that period the Whig ;l party has heeu ir.lii..*mi(;d iito;a seotiorial party, under the nm'e-u;.. the Aqj-ublioan party, whilst the Deinoeratie pt.< l.V continues lheiame natiiniil party it was at th-at 'liuy.' ' All sectional men,; all men' of Abolition scntimanis and '.prin'oiplea, na matter wh'etlW they wore old Aboiitionistg or ii'ad been Whigs or Democrats, .1 ally Under the.sectihnal '.Eepublioan banier, and consequently atl national 'men' all Union loving, men,, whether. Whigs, Demo- erats or by whateve;- name they hiive been.knowii, pugh't to rally under ,,,e'siar.s'andptripesin.defenoe of the Cbnstttution.as put fathers made it, and of the Uuion as'i't has existed under.the Constitution. How has this departure from the faith of .t'ae De~ mociacv a:."d the-faith of tbe. Whig party been acoomp'lished?- Inl854,:oerlain.ireslleas, ambitmus. and disappointed politicians throughout .the land took advantaee of the temaorary excitethent .cre- ated by the Sj^raska bill to .try and dissolve the old Whig party and .the old Democratic pacy, to abojitlonize their membera and ;lead them, bound hand and foot, captives into

the'abulitipn camp. .Ih tbe Staiteof New York a .conveitunwag held, by "some of these- men:and a platform adopted, evefy --liink f which wasas blapk. as nii;ht. .each ene : r(-i-ii lit; if> the negro, and nnt one. reterrng to.the '.iBieref?8-of ili'whita man. ..That .example"?ias .followf'ed throughout tCe Nbrthfirn.State,s,.the effect being'made to combine all the free States in hostile arrff against tbe slave States). The men whotbus thought that they could build up a great sectional parly and through its organiitipa-obntrol tbe jxo- fitical destinies- X)f this: country, based al,l. thair hopes on the single tact that the Korlh .wa8;;t&e sti'onger division of' the nation, and hence, if the .North could be.oonibijied against thp South, .a.sare 'victory awaited their etiorts.. I ara doing" no nioj-e. than justice to 'the tnith of history when I say t%u; in this State Abraham Linoobi,,pa behalf oflb^ ^Whig's -And Lvoiin. Trumbull, on. behalt ot *! D'empdrats, we're vhe.teadera .who: undertook tc perform, this grand scheme ot abolitionismg th' .two parties -to. which they b^lonjied.. They had^a private arrangement as to wljat should be thapoliti cal destiny ol each of the cbiilracting parties.bef6rd they went iute the operatiom The ^arrangeibenS- was that Mr.Lincoln.waji to take Um old line Whiga with '^in, elaiminff that he .was still as good.sj Whigase-.-er. over to the Abolitionists,, and Mri Tru'iibull was t<^ run for Cougr*6e in the Delleviila diHiiist. and, cla\ning tu be a good Uemooi-at, ooax tlie old Detnocrats into the Alwlitiou camp, and when,' by the. joint etferts of.the aboHtior.liedj Whig's, the aboUtronized; Democrats,:a'nd'the old line Ab&lition.and Fi:ee Sod party of tbis StateJ they should' secure a majority- in the legislature.; Lincoln was then to be made U-nitod States Sen-ator. ill Shields'place, Trumbul remaining in Congress nntil 1 should be acodoinodating enough tD dia or resign and give him' a chance to: fallow Lin; coin. (j.iightwva.ppl.MiM,,and.cr4aof>mWt4>.") That was .. very nice little bargain so far as Lincoln and TrumbuU were concerned, if it.had .been car- ried out in good faith, and trletid Lincoln had at; tained to senatorial dignity according, to the'.oont ; 'tract. Thev-wentin to the contest ui every psrt. of the State, calling upon-all: aisappointed politioians to join in the crusade a.tsaihst: tbe 'D mocracy, and : -appealed to the prevailing sentiments and preju(. _ dices inall the northern; counties of the Slate. ^ li? ; three Congressional districts an the north end of . the State they adopted, as tbe.plationin of this.ne?^ " party thus termed by Lincoln and Trumbo'U in th^ ^ connection with tbe Abolitionists, all hi .those prin- . cipleswhich.aimed at a:warfare Qn.;the part of. thp North against the .South. They, declared in thajt j platform that the Wilinotprovisa was to be applied j to all tbe territories of :the..United States, North ap j well as South of 86 dpgv 80 miu.,,:and,nct only-to allthe territory we then had, but_allihat we mlgat hereafter acquire ;: that. hereafter no ; more .slavfe \ States should be admitted into'tWs Union, even ^t the ! 'ple of such Stale desired slavery; that the fugitive slave law should be absolutely and uncori- .ditibually repealed; that slavery should 6e abolisH- ed in the District; of Columbia; that.tbe slavte trade should be abolished between the different. States, and, in fact, every article in their creed.r4-. lated to this, slavery question, and .pohited to b - 'Northern geograpKical party, in . hostility to. ih|B Southern i^tates of this Union. Such .were the^ principlesin Northern Illinois. .A.little furthej: south they: becahia hlesched and grew paler. jnSt i proportion as



public sentiment, moderated iind changed in this direction. They .were. Kepnblicai^ or Abolitionists, in the nortbi. anti-Nebraska meh down about Springfield, aiid in this neighbbrhooji they contented themselves with talking about tue iaexpediency of the. repeal oflHe,Missouri .c6n | - promise.

^SIM>t-eWiiwghter.) In the extremie northern counties they brought out men to canvass -the State-whose omplejrioD siiited: :their :poUtoil BrMil.. ^Bd . hence: -Fjtcd 'DbualM., th. ueUvO. was tp VS" fo""I there., following, (ieneral -Oass, and,'- attemptiBg to sbeik on behalf df Lincoln, TrumbuU and abolitionism. ;against that Ulilstrious SeaatoR. ...(Bftaawod-Mghtw.) .Why,. ithlybrought-Pred D.ougliis.tO Freoport when I.was addressing a meeting there in a carriage driven by Ui^ white.owner, thei'-agro. sitting; inside with,the wljite lady and.het daughter. i%iie.).' When 1 got through canvassing the northern counties that yepr and progi-e^sed far south as .Spriagllel.d, 1 wis. met and.,M>poj)!! ,iu.i diicuS8ion:by .Lincoln,^ Ldvejy.fTrutaimi. .!ip,d;Sjdntjy; Bfees?.. who lyere. or one aide.: iitma^f^} Father biddings, the hio'h-oriest. of a |o)iluiiswm, had .justbeea thp.ie., aiKl -Chase, cariie a'ooliit;;the time. 1.left- .(i*-W*J, 3iM5UujtasAaiii:) i did take;a ruumpg ^lot atj them', but-SSl.waS.siBgle haudiSd, against tne white,:black.iind mixed; drove, .1 l8d to us^ a.shoi;t giTnand fire into thelcrowtl >DSte;aaiOt.taking thepi. cf siagly *vitb ,a. rifl.s. (4j*tiMgbfeBiu)4oi8,); T-uobutl hadfor b:S lieutenants, ia aidioghim.to, ii!ioiitionie.the .demo^r.scy, such njep, as. John W entworth, oCChicago, Gov. BeyBplds,-o:f B.eUo- v !t:,iidney Br?eBe,,.oi. Car!ii>!e, and John :Dough; e t-v,- of;Union,:(i49f^^e^='*-g*<*^<'""^ '^*^'^**''''4* tt Bii&te)f efeoh otwiom'modi'fied Ms opimons to. silttiie.particular locality he was in. Dougherty, filr instance, would. not go. much . further than to ;t41kiiSout the iRexf)edieiioy!Of thP Nebraska bill, .Jiilsthis. ajliesat Chic-^iga.ad-ROcated negro .citi- zlnship and .negro, equality, putting the ;wbite man ajid the,Bej^o:bn. the .sanae.b.aSis under tbe. lay. :(|I9vr, ne:ver.) Now-.theso men, four ;y6ars ago, ere.engaged in-a conspiracy to break down the emooraovT; to day they are. again acting together. fir the same pnr^wispi .

They: da upt hoist the same :flag; they do iictofejij. iha same pj-inciples, or prp.. , fjiss. tbe s'artie faith ;. but do09al their union fur the ke of policy., Ini.the nortljBrn.counties, .you find that ajl the conyebUdlis are palled:In the name of; the Black;Republican party;:.sit Bpringfeld, they ^re not. call ^. Bepublican Convention, but. invite 111 tbe.eBemie?:of the. democracy to unite, and when tfiaj get dqwn into Egypt,;.Trumhull issues notices;, liiug upon the "free democrat)/" to.assemble and ear him iipeak. XhavaoneDt the handbills,oaUing ITraKihuU meeting.at Waterloo the other day) hich I rseeivPd. thtSre, wk(ichlis in the follpwiiiK,, .nguaga.: ; .. ." :: ' . . - '- A meeting oftUe Free Democraojr wUl take place to "War fcrloo. on ^ondks- ^P'-.!*", ""?:i??.'!"^k,/^ f..y."J "% ii-umbuU, Sjon. Jol-n-Baker and othei-a.w U adiireia the 8 pie upnn the liiffereht pr.lii leal toptes of the' day. Mem-lors of all parties are oordinllv invitefl to bs present, aud learajid determine for tiinema.lycs.. _ .:^ ^ , ... THK MoNKOB FBBj: DEMOOBiCT." What is' thA 'uamo',01 ".Free ljemocr,ats" put j orth for unless to d^c^ive the:people> and make i liem believe that ,> rumb ull.and His followers are lot tbe same party as that^tich; raises .the,'black lag of Abolitionism in the northern'part 6f this itjate, and lnakeS war upon the Dsimocratio party ;hroughont the Stat, Wlien I put that question ,0 them

ftt Waterloo.,on.Saturday last, one.pf.them -ose and stated that they had changed their name for)bUtical 'effect' in order to get totes. There ifas a oaudid admission. Their object, in cbanguig ;beir party organization, and principles In different ocalitaes was a.vowed to be ap attempt to cheat and J^c^ive some porSion of Jhe people _untilafter the election. WVI cannot a'politicallygarty thdt is conscious; oil the rectitude, of ,ils'l)urpo8es and piiundpe,^ of its .principles^ declare them \:v/ -M'r.-tp aHke. .Iwould disda;in'to hold any lolit'ical ji.rinpile:a that;I could not avow in tlie ame ten...a in K.-jtuoky thiit 1' declared in Uiaois, in Chirl'..:.'j'..m as' well fs in Chicago, lij .^ew Orleans as vyell.a? ip N'dw'Tork. ^eilWWr) So ong as we live under a ooii'^titution jjoifimon to all the States, our Bpiiticfil fahh ought, to be as broad, i ke liberal, and Jifpt as that ^onatiuuop ilseii, and , Eould be proclaimed alike in every po.rtiou f.t the Jnion, .(HtTnie.i Butit is apparjsnt that; our bpponeents djid it necessary, for ffartizan efteui, lo Ehange their colprs in different counties in order 'o batch the popiilai- breeie, and hopewjth these dis- 0. i 4 ii

'34iS 11 1 I B ^M!! i

"^Sk'.^,.^ a^,S3i i ^ lfee*^ 3ordaut juateriuls oombiued to^et|ir to secure a majority in the legislature for tlift-jpurpbse o| piiii- tipt; (lown tti4;Demuoraiio piity. This combination ii(fst;cqe6(J iii,l?&iso ;ar aS tji elect a taaj >ritj of their,cpnt'ederates tc> tfiet legislature,, and the first importapt act, which jhe^f: performed vf&H to elect o 3eHi>tor Ip the pl^?e of ^he eminent ami Kal'ont 5eaftt<)r, Bhlel^s. His ljerpi e'xpired in the United States Seij^te at that tirpe, and he had to be crush ed by the abolion ooal-.tion for the .simple reason thatjlie,would aot jcic , -s thejj. oonspiraoy to wage war Jgaipst ope-half > th"6; Uaioh. That was the oaiy oijjectiion to (Jen. Sliitelds. ' He had served the p&pU of the Btat? with' ability tn the legisla- ture, fee bad; seryed you with fidelity, and ability a% auditor,; h* had performed. his duties, to the satjsfijiotiop of thS whole country, at h'eid of the Ljod; ljcpMt""? ^t "I ^\ashiugtoo, he had covered the Sta.. ani^i the Tlnioh with immortsil glory ba the.blo".. rflelds of M,exiqo in defence'of the bouoi' of our l., and yet he had to be stridden down by this unholy ,combination. Apd for; what,cause? Merely-beottt'19 he woiJld not join a oonibination of one half o;^ th^Slat'^s to'make ifrar 'upon the other _ half, a^ter having poured out hi.s heart's; blood for aji the .i^tates in th ijuipn.'. Trumbull was put in-; his place ^y abolitiOQiBm. ; How did Trumbull got there V Be.fore tljS ijbolitiaaists would consent to go into an flection for tJnited States Senator they required all the members ; of this now oomhination., to show their' han'4's uppo this question -'. 'Cff .; aljolitiifliiem. 'Lovejoy, one of of their hiali prleHts, brought ijo; resolutions dcnn- ' ing the 'abolition creed, and required them to com- mit themselvea on it lJy their vote's yea or nayj In thftt opeed, -.as laid down by Lovejoy, they declared first, tljat tUe 'Wilmot prg*iso must be: put on all Irhe tpri-itOf le? bf the United States north as well as south of 86 dfeg. SO "min., and that no; more terriiory. should, ever be acquired unlees slavery; was at firft prohibited thersin; second, that no; mpre.ijtates should e:v8r .be reoeiSed'irtto. the: dWbu unless 'slavery

wa8;flrtpr'<bibltedj by qonstitutiqnal.prptission, in such States; third,- that the fugitive .siavo law
mUst be imhiediatly repeale(l, orj failing in that, tlieu Such anaendtaents were tp be made, to it
'as woildd render; it usglss jndrnefflqient for the plljeots for which it was passed, iSte.. The;n'ext
day after these reSolutioiia were ofifered th6y were voted upon,,; part of them carried, and the
othe.rsi defeated,: the ;Bame men who voted , for th^cbi wiith only two exceptions^ voting soon
after for Abraham Liaholn as their, candidate for the United States Senate. 'He came within OM
or two votes of beioq elected, buf he j oould not quite got the number required, fpr th.a simple
reason that his friend Trumbull, who was a party to the bargain by which Xiuooin was to take Shields'
place, controlled a few nbolitioaized'Deino- crats in t!he legislature, and would ncH allow them all
to vote, tor him, thus *rOnging Lincoln, by perrdlttitig irim: 'on; each baiHot to :be ;.almost elected,
but: ,not quite. ntil he; .fcreed them to'drop Lincoln and elect him (i'fumbull), t order to unite the:
party, (imm'en'se laughter.) Thus you find, that tilthough :the; legislattire Wtts. carried that year by
the bargain between'Trumbull, Lint Coln.,and.the Abolitionists, and the union of. these discordant
elements in ona barmonians party; yet Trumbull:violated hiS pledge!, and-phiyed a yankiie trick
fen: Lincolnwoeni they came to divide: Uie OTioiEs. (liajililateJ,jte.4.:9hS-er%. .J.4ioc*5lBj?rtatif yt.
wBSld ~3ite alittlo evidence on this pbint. If yon would, 'i will; <ShH'.i.io!.-Jas. :H. JMathfcny,'of
Jjpriagfield,. to the Btati*, Mr. Lincoln's especial eonfideutial Iriend fo. :the last twenty years, and
See what he will: Say;upon the :subject of this bar; gain.: Matbeny: is.'npw the Black Kepublioan
or ii*alition candidate,for Congress ia;tb9-Springfield .iistriot against the gallant eol. Harris, lind.is
toakint! speeches: all over -that tiart of ;th State against me'and in tavbr of Innobln, iii concert
with TY-nmbuU. iU. otightta be a good witnbss, and.I will read'iaii extract frohi k speech wKlch he
made in 1858, when he was mad beoausfr. his tVieml Lm coin; bad been oheatid. It is - .one of!
numerliuS iiv;ci!ohes Dt. the Same tenor that were made abent th-it tune;:elpua'ng. ihisbargaiiS.
between Lin oln, 'l'rumimU, and: tlio- Abolitloniste. Matheiiy then satd: : " , . " . -'! X"1:he WMss,
ihoHtfonlsts. Know-NottilhKs, aiii rraegade ' a)din6cratKmad!i:i:solemr.rompactfort!iP jrarpQse
ot carry- injtiia State asainss tlie Democracy, on this islaa-s lsi. ' = pledge theraaelvas that Lincoln
should be their can- didate for the SetTute ; and you will tind, in prooi of this,-that, that eohvention
passed a resolutioo unanimously declariQg:that Abrabam Lincoln was tha "first, lawand oaly
choice" of the Kopublicans for United States Senator. lie was not willing to have it "understood that
he'was merely tbeir flrsit choice, or their last choice, but their only choice.-* The Black Republican
party ,had nobody else.-f Browning was dowhere, Gov. Bissell was of no M- count, Archie Willi.
ms was not to be taken into consideration,..John Wentworth was not worthtnen.'- tionijg, Johu-
M. Palpier was degraded, and theij: party presented the exivfuirdinary spectacle of hav- ing but
one the first, las,, and only, choice for the Senate. : (li'awglitiCj:')' .poSe Lincoln should die, .:*liat
a;horribll8 concinon the Hepublican party : would bB ib. .(4,^B)*ftj'5m-l'ieo*%""*^~** lIMIBJtW)
They wouM hay^. nobody left. They t^ave lib. other'choice, and'It wasneCBSi^y for.tUem Vx put
themselves beforsthe worldiii this ludicrous, liatc9.lus attitude of having no other choice ib order

to. (juet Lincoln's sospicionss, and assflrc uim that he Wai not to be c'aeated. by Lovejoy, and. the
-tricltery Joy" 'which .Ti-uqbull out generalled hiai. Well, geftilemen; I-think they .Will ba*e a nice
timie of it before they get through. 1 do not intend to ' give them spy libanoe to cheat Lincoln at
all this time.. i^Wwmbk) . I: intend to relieve -bim arid theija __ all anxiety upoh that sut^eot, and
spare tbetti. ie moftiittoatiin . ot more; exposures: of contracts folated, .and the.pledged honor, of
rogues forfettbd. \- aKalnstthe-Democvats.- 29, l'hatwhenthelenislatauieshould . met. A ollicHB
oftbatboay, Such ^s'Bpeaket.clerka, door , keepers. &o-.. wOuici be Kia'en tO- t'ae Ab'Jlltionists;
and 6a, That the Whigs were lo have the TJnitSd States feenator. That, aocordlnsly, iBgood faitb,
T umtmll was elected to Coiikrets, aod'his "tBtriiit, can-it^ for the j.'sislature, and. , wh n't C0i"ve!
ied.-tlie Abolitioms; got all. tbe officers of tbatb'cir; and ,<h)is.'far ihe -bontf' w; „l.aiils',xeou,e<l. 1
to tKi^seives aji-that wo culled foi-i. But. to the I ,1 i^etlicious mabnei.-iljey rafuied ta- elect: Mr..
Lincoln 1 auci friS ffle?n, lo.w.lived.' nsUng .l'rutobuil Wjooeeded, by bledat.B;llthatwas:ri'qulredby
anypartj. IO.thru3.Ini! Lip- Cd.i\8&- aird foisting bimlt an ejcrescjuMfrom the rat- ten bowttU'chheDj-
mocracy, Into the Cnltd States SeoatJJ, -afldthuBitha-ever been, t;t :an A<me<manmakea bad)
bargain wbeti be CSnsptter.orciSDtract!; with rogues. ^ I irab3njthouglttthit his; iriend Luic.QIn
made': bad ba.j?wa V-hen he consjftred,add contracted with such l'bgii'is jia'Trumbftll and his
aholitiou a 90- .qiatetinthatqimpaign.. XfiH>M***M'*I*h- sUjp^ed of tbe track, and ha andWs
friends. _** ! ones hegan tsmbe; becJa'ma sotir iud jaa4}3&Wl!^1 tal*nd.disposed: to.teU, bufdare
not; (|4m>-< taSte*)' aiid this they Stood (or a log time.unta theAbolitibaistS coaxed and flattered
him. bank m their" assurances tbftt he Shoufd Cettkinly be;a^ SenatOT in Douglas' place.' (aioafr-
.**^! Linogln. U),QkiU)i:;aij,if .be liad 6ot. .&te*.att*^, feSnSSS) la that way the AboUtio.a.-
its, .hav< ^enabled to hold Libcola to the alliap :e Up X> this time, and now they have broug'ht.hlin
into fiaht.against me, and hciS'to Sete if ha is agai; to be cheated by them, ; Lincoln thiS ti(ba;^though
i-eq'uired m'ore bf thera than .a promise, and .boldi their bond, if not ecdrity, thaf. LoVqoy shall not
cheat-hi. as Trumbull did. (BtoiBww^gbawto^t *.ir,rm.,fIMd in Junel'dst-for the purpose of nominal
jsuited to ths rioe plantations of South fiSata officers ohbtthe AboSiLsts could not H'a.y did not
beheve at that -day that m w 1 _____ 11 1';,. l^an^,Ta iiiiFr. ^1t'ait;yiiiiiui8.)...... , Sut J wwh td'invite
your atterttipn tq the chief poitits at issue between'-Mi-: LihiiFelh and myseli In this djsoussiou. Mr.
Lincoln, knowing that he was to be the candidate of his-party on account ot the ar- raiifc;ement of
which! have already Bpciken, kaow- ipjathat he;w.as to receive the: nomination ot thf Q^ventio'n ot
the Uniid 'StMes': Senate, had his 'sptiech, ficcepting that n.jtnihafioil, all written and coAraited to
memory; ready to be delivered the n;.(Jneni the nomination was announced. Accord-: inSly, when It
wis mad he'was in jeadiness,-ao.d dolivereki: his 8pec'b,.a portion of which I will read,j inbrder that 1
nav state Ms* political principles faifly, hy repeating them in his own lahguai^e. > "lw^arenowfarinto
tL-efifthyyearsliwe-apolky waslnatltu. tfed for the avowed object, and wiiU the opaadent prom se
of pvitlnsaneidto slavery asfation; under ths ope-aiion o; thdt policy, ill .t alta iob had' o'nly not
ceased, but hai cpn- srart y augmented. I bejleye-it wi 1 not. cease until a wla'a i-.hiU'have bteu

reached and passed. , A house divided against itself cannot stand. .1 Belleva.thls .govemu'ept can-
 ^n 4 (>aditre'BMiiianEbtly:iialC5UTe:|(n4 .-bal' fi.ejs. .I.do..!o.t., exhPbtthe D;il8E 10 be di'solven,
 ldo:pot6xprotiheho,tf?f: to fcu.' ut-l (lo.expcot it-wll cease to be divided. It 411 b. cofae all obe thing
 or all the other.- Bither. .Ijhe cpuo :ent9 of sWverywlll arr lit the Bir.adof it and.pl ceitivhtfetlicpublic
 mlb'i s^all rest la the beiiat thaUt is in th^ C'QUrie ot uh.lmats, extinction, or its adVocai^s will push
 it foiw.ai d' unalit i,ha i bepome alike lawful in all tbe States Npnh.aa wea.as aomu." . iThere^you
 have Mr. Jjirioola's iirst and maip pro^ position, upon which he bas?s his d!aiaia,:stated in, life
 oiyti language. .:JHe tellayoiij that this Eepablip Baniia.:onduf6'| ierp3iiij%. 'divided,into, Bla,ve. aij<j
 free; Statt>-B;'s-oar fafbiy:s'made if,. -.ae.say.s.tla.t;.. tley tmi.-it ail bepome .^ree or all becom'b
 slave,-that .ti ey must all be-oue'thihg or all-he the b.thc.r;:6r, this government cannot last. 'Why
 can it not last. if we vlf execute the :gov'irnrrienl in the Same siiirlt and upon thesame prindiples
 upon which it is fcunded'. 'Lincoln; by Us projfoSitiot, says to the South, "If you desire.t6 Aiaiiitiij
 yoUr institutions- ias they are now, you.' must not be safisfied with' :diindiig"your own business,
 but you'must invade' iTliiiois aiid all-the 'dthet" northern States, establish slavery in th'em "and
 make' it'uniVefsal;" and ip-the .skme language he says to the north, "you muSt - ribf be cdnteul
 'withrfequlating your own aftairs and - liindiDg your own business, but if you desire -to 3iai.ntain
 your freedom ypa must ipvade the South; '^tn States, abolish slave.ry there and everYivhere, ip
 order to have the States all one thing or all the .Alter." . 1 say that- this.is the inevitable and iij-e-
 slstibie i:suU of-Mr.. Lincoln's,atgpmenticvitiing.i(warfare between' the.Botth .Sud the: Sonth, to 1)6
 (iirried on wifb ruthless vengeapo'e; until th';;ope ifction or the other ssball be driven tp.the.wfill ,apd
 liacome the victim of the rapacity of the other. VVLat good would follow such a, .system of war-
 fare?. . Su-ppose -the Ijorth. should, succeed in doiiquering the:South, how much .'(ould:she be ie
 gainer, or :supposd the .South shquld oouquer the; NortK .could the Uniou be preserved in i,hat
 ivay? ;Is this sectional, warfare to be waged be- tlvcen Kortheru States iind: Southern States uptil
 tjiey all shall become uniform in their local and.db,. iiestio institutioaa merely, becjause .Mr. Lincoln
 gays that a house divided against, itself c(innot stand, and pretends, thatf this scriptural quotation,
 ^lis.language of ourLord and Master, is applicable io the American Union and the American onstitu-
 fiooj,? Washington and '.bus compeers in tbe oou- Vention that framed the constitution, made this)
 (overnmeht divided into tree and slave.States. it, : -^as ootuposed tbeu of thirte'Sn sovereign-and
 ipde- icndent States, each having,sovereigu authority iver its local an i domestic iosituti ms, and ^11
 iouad together by the federal constitutlop. Mr. jirtccan likens that: bopd Of the federal cbstitutloa-
 joinirig' ft<?'6. and' .slave SfaMs togethe^to a house; jliviaes agaipui itsolii ah4.ays .that it .Isicaplrstry
 fl the law oi God and cannot stand. . -When did he earn, and by what authority ,do?s . he proclaim:,,
 hat this government is contrary to thp lav ol ood, lud capRot stand t It has stood th,u8 divided ipfb
 Tee and slave States from Its prganiEation Pp to ,b!s day. .:Durig tiat period we have iuoreased
 torn four millions to thirty millions of people j we 11. re extendad out territory from the Mississippi
 t,o .iio;i'(iiflc Qoeap; we have acquired the Floridas ipd fexiis nnd other territory suffciept to double

Sur .georapbical elteBt;- ' WC have inci'eased. ip bopulaiiou, iii woalDi, ..and tn pojver beyond apy
ex- Kraple op earth; we l'Aye.riseo from a weak aod fee-tile power to becomi; liio tr)or apd adpiir-
dtiou | of tbe civilized world; and all this has beep dope under a. copstitutiou: which Mr. Ljnooip,
in sub- stance, siya is ia, violation ot 'ua jaw of God, and under a upiop divided into : 'nn' and slave
States, w|iich Mr. Lioooln thinks, ocpause of such diviiiop, cappot stapd,- Surely,. Mr. :i.v sTin Is a
wiser ciap thap those who framed the govern- meat..- ' .Washi-pgtoP: did-Hiftt" belieynv nor-airf his'
60!BJ)atrloi:K, -theV--tbp'5 l'Ocst; :'''f'''f';, xud dome.stio ipstitutious thiit' ' we.fi''' 'well adapted to the
green mountains of'Vermopt -wei-e " -fft--..u (jarolipa; epuljUc whep"the Bepublic&a convention
lissembled a.\ "' ' " ^-^ m "iotLincoln and l'vis Iriendaiuto 't untiTthey w'Ould m Urdad upd
expanded as ..this, contalnipa suCu a O / I I |

- Hm^iHiii.atmi'WMtti

j^^Ha' ^;,<sjjr-^f!^ - ^ ^rmismmm^ammmi^^^^ 'A f i

f

'^~^ifesfi^ variety of oUmat, soil and iuterest, that uniformity ;ii) the local laws and
domestioiustituUDuswaseither jdesirable or possible. They believed then as our iexperieoce has
proved to uejubw, that each locality,' I having different interests^ a different climate aiid i different
surroundings, required different local la we,' Uoeal policy and local inatitutions adapted to the
wants .of that locality. Thus our government was formtxl on th6 principle of diversity in the local
in- stimtiotia anji laws and not on that of uniformity. ; As my tim'e flies, I oaa cnly.glaneejat these
points and, -not present them as lully as f would'wish, be- oausa I desire to bring all the points in
controversy between the two parties before you in order to have Mr. Lincoln's reply.- He makes war
on the de-iisidn of the Suprema Qourt in tlie case knowii as the Dred Scott case, I wish tosay tu'yuu,
tellow-oitijieus, that-I have novwar to make on tliat deoiulon, ofany' other 'eyer,, riijndered by_ the
Su- prenae Court, vl am content to'taks ^hat decision as It stands delivered by tlii hightjst'jad.ioial
tribunal on earth, a tribuual established 'by th'6 Oonstitution di the United States lor that purpose,-
and hence that decision becomes the'law af the laDd,.biudbg 013 you, oW me, and pt} every Qthr
good citizen, whether we iik* it or not. Hence I do not choose to go ihto an argtftuent'td prove,
before xhia'audience, whether of not'Chief Justice U'aney understood'the law better than Abrahv.m
Lincoln. trXmnghtigi;) .. Mr. Lincoln objects to that'decisipu, ttrjt and maihiy.bf'caase it'deprives
the iiegfo oi the rights' of citizenship:- "I am as mueh'opposed to his reason . fpr that etj(:olion
as I aiu to the o'ojection itself. I hold that a riegro is'not and-never ought to be a citizan of the U
nited States. 4flaadH50aii.J4IM' jaaBd(<wolle>ia.) 1 hold that this governpaent was made on the
white basis, by white:men,'for the benefit of white men and their posterity, forever; and should
b'e admilii^tered by white men>Bd none others. !! 4o not believe,that the Almiah('y made the

nearo Capable, of self-governmtent. 'I am aware thit.all.the AoSition lecturers that you tlntravel-
 ingaboiit through th6 oontry, are in the habit of reitdiiigtbe Declaration' of IndEpendenpe to pi'ove
 thai'all taenwfjre createtl equal and 6n<^wed by their' Creator 'with-; onrtato 'ipaHenabls . n^iits
 among which .ate, life, liberty, and; tjie pursuit o| happiueis." lar. Lincoln is very inuoh in the habit
 Of following in the track ot Lov^uy in this particu- lar, by readiilg that part of the lJeclaratioij ot
 Inde-- pcndeaoe to prove that the nezfb was endowed by the Aliaighty with the inalienable ri^ht of
 Kquality with white .iSeii.'. Now, 1 Ray,to you, ifiT tello-tr- citizeuB, lbitt tii mSr opinion the signers
 of the Da-, olaration had no -reference to (he negro-wfl-atever whSn thy declared all men :to -be/
 CTeated equal.' 'Th&y desired .to" express _; by ' that phrase, white; men,.' men . of -European
 birth a,nd European., desoent, .and had M .reference eitiier to the. negro, the sava.a;e Indians,,
 the Fejee; the Malay;oritoy Otherinfetior aad dtjgradert'racp, when they spo'ke of'the equality of
 men. . One great eVideuce 'that steh was their'understanding, ia; to be fouo'd in the fit;that .at that
 time every one of the thiHeeu' coloni'es Was a sjaveholding'colony, every Signei! .of lie Declaration'
 reprjisednted a slave- holding CDB8tituelioy;and -we "know thai ao one of them emanOdated"
 hlg Slaves, much, less offered oitizouship to.thein when.they*OgHed the Declara- tion, and yet,,
 if they had' juwoded to declare that the negro was'the "equal:of thi, .white man, .and entitled "
 by divin* rigbt ttt:an, eqBality with hfint, thev were hound,: as hoastmen, that day and hour to
 have pattbeir negcbes on aa-equality with'1(16111- selvea. (**,},' ia'stsad' of doing ,sq, with ,.up
 iii'ted syeii to Heavah they implored , 'the Divine .TheDred Scott decision covers the whole quei-
 tion, and declares that each State has the right lo settle'this' question, of auffraga' for it.si;if, and
 afl questions as'to the,relations between the white mam and the'negrp. Judge Taneyexpressly l'ays
 dow.n the;doctrine, I, receive u as layv, and I say thitt 'While those States are adopting regulations on
 tJSjiti, < subject disgusting add ahhorreot, according to '.uy '\ views, I will :d6t mako war on them if
 tney w|,I, mind their own business and let,us alone. IstHtlt I now qoioo back to the jjneatlon, why
 cannot this Union xi8t forever; divided into free nd slate States as our fathers made it? It ea^ thus
 exist if each State will carry out the principles upon which .?-"?""l.'itutiOQa were founded^ to wit:
 the ri-^lit of -eacfr State to^o aa-it-'pjias'S.^fiKwirinc'ii'd'ling' .with its neighbors. Just act upon that
 great ptip. olj)l*, and this.Union will nqt onlv.live forever lut' It wjll-e^ftepd and erpand until it covers ;
 I ij wimr^^ .confaent, and; make t&is confederacy oni.' "rand ocedni bown4 republic. We>must
 bear iirtnirid "that nye ^reyp a young;nation growing n'iil(a t'op^dltv- unehualled in the history of
 the world; that "oitrna. ^T M'^^f^^ '* ?8t. and that the emigraiioti trori the;old world,is increasing,
 requ&iiig; na to.i e;if and and aoquire.uew territory froni.time;to tim?"i in (rder;to give pur people
 Jand to live upon! If ' we ive upon tjie principle qf State rights apd Slate, ^i sov jreignty, each State
 regulating Us own atfiir? ' anc minding its own business, we can goon ^nd'ejtr ten 1 indeflptelv, just
 as fast and as fat- as sje pegd" the territory. The time may ooqie, indeed ha^'now"" cor 18, when
 our interests would be acjvaiicpd bytfi.e i ace uisitipn ,of the islapdof Cuba; ;j;i;eri;i'fic'ap., gla ise.)
 VS^hen we get Cuba we mnst taK.e is as we ' fin* it, leaving tbp people to decide the que^co"6f '

[illegible]

to the ;peo- ' pie, shoulTbe followed in all future cases, and if :h j,ands by that reoommendation there ,wii bo no dgi; vision in the ftomooratio psrty on that; principle in the future. , Heuee, . the great itiissi:on: of the Democraov ,. is- to unite the fraternal. l'eelitg of the .whole country, restore peace aadq-ii^ !bjy teaching eech State to mind its own Vbusities.s, apd regulate its own domestic affairs, aiidallio.i unite oan-ying,out the constitution a* our fathers . tnado It and thus to preserve the Union.and render ; it perpetual iij all. time to come. \V,iy s'loil 1 \9 Hut sot.as our fathers who made the govjriiment?; there was no seciional strife in Wasniif-ton's army.- 'Ei.ey were all brethren:of a common canfe 'e;racy., tp'-iy:fought under a commoi Sag.that.they might,; ' tjestow upon their poeterfty a'common dc-ftiny, and hid that rjuht to decide the question for ourselves ;'*j thij^end they jxiiirod out their blodd in Sommog; WB must reoognijte the same right in Kehtuoky and - J-aftn* at'd' sbared in some instaudes aconimou in every other State to-make the same decision, or fraye., (j adiHereptonO. .Having decided our. own '{loU.cy j with reiei-epce to the black race, we tnastleayo^ Kentucky and Mlssouri and every other -State per. faotly free to make just such a decision as they.seej proper on that question. ' , ' , ! Kentucky has decided that questien for her.s.e:ltj She has i>aid that within her limits a negro shalj notexeroise any political rights, and she has also said that a portion of the negroes under the law3:ol that State shall be slaves.. Shejhad as much right < to adopt that as her policy as tve hud to adopt ihe ^ contrary for pur pohoy.- New York has decided ' that in that State li liegro may vote if he has, \$250 worth of property, and if he owns that .mnob he may vote nbrfn an equality with the white man. 1, tor one, am utterly opposed to negro suffrage anywber* and onder any'clrt!u^!st.^nces; .yet,.jnashwiih as the Supreme Uuhtt have decided in the celebrated / Drfed Scott case'that a State has a right to conler the privilege' of vbtiaq upon free negroes. I arp not gomg'to make war upon New York because :8h6 has adopted a policy repugnant to my feelIn'gi OSmfB-W"^-) But Nsw York must mind her owh - business, apd keep;her negro Suffrage tol'^ffe'ffwP < not attempt to force it upon us. i^Jxn*-m^^n In the State of Maine they have decided that Ji negro may vote and hold ofiloB on an equality with a white map'. I had occasion to say to the Senatoiis from Maine in a discussion la.<t session, that if th* tboilght that, the white people wiihm the limits M their State were no.belter than negroes, I wquld not quarrel with therh tor it, but they mnst not i^sy thftt my white constituents of Illinois were no bettttr than negroes, or we wouLd.be sure, to quarrejl. Mr. liicolii'a Kcply. . . , Mr.iinoln -wasTTife'h introdncii-to th.i| di- ..gliceby D. L. Phillips,Esq., and wa,s greeted-wit-h- tiiiee.cheersjand then, "three -laope};"" tteKkiel ie said: Lames and Gestlbmen: There is very much in the principles that Judge Di.'uglas has here enunciated that I most cordially approve, and over- - which I shall have no controversy with him. In so far as he has insisted that all th* States have the right to do exactly as they please about all their domestic relations, including that of slavery, ; I agree entirely with h m. He places me wrong 1 in spite ol all I can tell him, though I repeat it ^ again and again, insisting th'it I have no differ- ence with him upon this subject. I have made a great many speeches, some of which have been piinted, and it will he utterly impossible for him to find anything that I have ever put in print con- trary to what I now say upon this subject. I

hold myself under constitutional obligations to allow the people in all the States without interference, direct or indirect, to do exactly as they please, and I deny that I have any inclination to" interfere with them, even if there were no such constitutional obligation. I can only say again that I am placed improperly altogether improperly in spite of all I can say when it is insisted that I entertain any other view or purposes in regard to that matter. /V' -4M2HiaW

>Sj^g^>' | | ^

'^""^B^ ^ While I am upon this subject, I will make some ' answers briefly to certain propositions that Judge 'Douglas has put. He says, " Why can't this ' Union endure permanently, half slave and half free?" I have said that I supposed it could not, and I will try, before this new audience, to give briefly some of the reasons for opposing that opinion. Another form of his question is, " Why can't we let it stand as our fathers placed it?" That is the exact difficulty between us, I say that Judge Douglas and his friends have changed them from the position in which our fathers originally placed it. I say in the way our fathers originally left the slavery question, the institution was in the course of ultimate extinction, and the public mind rested in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. I say when this government was first established it was the policy of its founders to prohibit the ' spread of slavery into the new Territories of the United States, where it had not existed. But Judge Douglas and his friends have broken up that policy and placed it upon a new basis by which it is to become national and perpetual. All I have asked or desired anywhere is that it should be placed back again upon the basis that the fathers of our government originally placed it upon. I have no doubt that it would become extinct, for all time to come, if we but re-adopted the policy of the fathers by restricting it to the limits it has already covered. Restricting it from the new Territories. ' >f. ' , , ^v i do not wish to dwell at great length on this branch of the subject at this time, but allow me to repeat one thing that I have stated before. Brooks, the man who assaulted Senator Sumner on the floor of the Senate, and who was honorably complimented with dinners and silver pitchers, and gold-headed canes, and a good many other things for that feat, in one of his speeches declared that when this Government was originally established nobody expected that the institution of slavery would last until this day. That was but the opinion of one man, but it was such an opinion as we can never get from. Judge Douglas or anybody in favor of slavery in the North at all. ' You can sometimes get it from a Southern man. -^He said at the same time that the framers of our Government did not have the knowledge that experience has taught us that experience and the introduction of the cotton-gin have taught us that the perpetuation of slavery is a necessity. He insisted, therefore, upon its being changed from the basis upon which the Fathers of the Government left it to the basis of its perpetuation and nationalization. I insist that this is the difference between Judge Douglas and myself—that Judge Douglas is 'helping that change along. I

insist upon th's. Gayernment being placed where our lath&rs originally placed it, ,...11. f remember Judge Douglas once said that he saw the evidences on the statute books of Oou- gress, of a policy in the origin of government to divide slavery .nd freedom by a geographioul line that he saw an indisposition to maintain that policy, and therefore ne wt. about studying up a way to settle the institution on the right bania-the basis which he thought it ought to have been place- apQB at flrst; and in that speech he co^{e*4#Ht *}> seeks to place it not .upon the basis tic'; thiT fathers biased it upon, but aoon one gotten up on "original principles When he aska ro why we cannot get along with it in tho aitude '.?here oar fathers placed it he had betvj. otear up the evidences that he has himsaif changed it from that basis; that he has hinigjllf b3on chiefly- instrBmental m changing the policy of the fathers. 6****^-. Any on< Who will read his speech ot the 22dof last iMarch, wiU scs that he there makes an open confession, showing that ne fiet about fixing the institution upon an altogether differoDt set ot principles. I think I have fully answered him When he aSkswe why we cannot let it alone upon the basis where our fathers left it by showing that he has himself changed th whole policy of the-Government in that regard. .s ,* Now fellow citizens, m regard to this matter about a contract that was made between Judge TrumbuU and myself, and all that long portion of Judge Douglas' speech on this subject-i wish simply to say what I have said to him be- fore that he cannot know whether it is true or hot,'andI<iO'iic'thatthcreis not a word of ?; Jui it. .>^.pllllli Audi have told him so jah*i' \ arsll iaujiu-uif,-^ Aijvi""^" j ----- _ know how to deal with this persistent nsisting on a story that I kno* te be utterly without truth. It used to be a fashion amongst men that when a charge was made some sort of nroof was brought forward to establish it, and if no proof was found to exist, the charge was dronned I don't know how to meet this kind of an argument; 1 don't want to have a fight with Judge DouaiaS, end I have no way of mak- ing an ariument up into th6 coisisteney ot a corn-cob and stopping b/s mouth with it. r^gBMHaMaap^tecC'I -^I' ^ <=^^^ do is, good- humaredlv. to say that from the beginning to the endofall'ttiat Sfjry about a, bargain between Judge TrumbuU and myself, ihenvs not award of truth in it. JIUllikw 1 can cnlt ask him to show some sort of evidence of the truth of his story. He brings forward here and reads from what he contends is a speech by James U. Matheny charging such a bargain between TrumbuU and myself. My own opinion is that Matheny did do some such immoral thing as to tell a story that he knew nothing about. 1 be- lieve he did. 1 contradicted it instantly and it has been contradicted by Judge 'lrumbuU, while nobody has produced any proof, because there is none. Now whether the speech which the Judge brings forward here is really the one Matheny made 1 do not kno*, and I hope the Judge will pardon me for doubting the geimine- .ness of this document since his prodnction 01 (those Springfield Beaolutions at Ottawa. .|>faiuiJlH'm'i""Uin"" I <*o o' '?'ish to dwell .-. ,tleDfth upon this matter, lean say at any g.- ^^^ ji^j jg jq,^ ^^_ nothing when a long stoirj. - _ , - cpt it is not true, and demand that ho ,..o 1^ sists.UDOn it shall produ.ce some nrrnf. That m all any man c^n ao, anu 1 lea-; 0 11 m tniit way for I know of no other way of dealing with' it. Tho Judgfe has gone over a long account ot the old Whig and Democr.itio parties; and it Connects itself vith this charge against Trum- bn-U and myself,

-He says that they agreed, up- 'oh a compromise in regard to the slavery ques- tion in 1850 ; that in a National Democratic . Convention resolutions were passed to abide by that compromise as a finality upon the ilavery tjnestion. He also says that the Whig party in NatTohai CTnvenliSn agreed to abide by 'and regard as a ttuity, the comproiiseof 1850. I understand the Judge to be altogether right about that; I understand that part of the his- ^ tory of the country as stated by him to be cor- ' rect I recollect that T, as a member of that 'party acquiesced in that compromise. I re coUec't in the Presidential election which fol- lowed when we had General Scott up for the Presidency, Judge Douglas was around berating i us Whigs as Abolitionists, precisely as he does L to-day not a bit of difference. I have often heard him. We could do nothing -^hsn the old Whig party was alive that was not Abolition- ism but it has got an extremely good name since it li'as passed away. Li niljllfcm-- When that comprorhise was made it did not repeal the old Missouri Compromise. It left a region of United States territory half as large as the present territory of the United States, North of the line of 86" SO' in which slavery was prohibited by act of Congress. This com \- s promise did not repeal that one. It did not affect or propose to repeal it. Biit at last it be- came Judge Douglas's duty, as he thought (and I find no fault with him) as Chairman ot the Committee on Territories, to bring m a bill for the organisation of a territorial government- first of one, then ot two {grrltories north ot that line When he did so it ended in his inserting a provision substantially repealing the Missouri Compromise. -That was because the compro- mise of 1850 had not repealed it. And now I ask why he could not have let that compromise alone? We were quiet from thu agitatida of the slavery question. We were making no fuss-about iti All had acquiesced in the com- promise measures of 1R50. We never had been i seriously disturbed by any abolition agitation I before that period. When he came to form governments for the territories North of the line ' of 36 SO', why could he not have let that mat- ter stand as it-was standing? ia^B|I^ . Was it necessary to the organization at a territory ? Not at all. Iowva lay llorth of the line and had been organized as a territory and had come into the Union as a State Without disturbing that Compromise. Thei'e was no sort of necessity for destroying it to organize these territories. But o-enilemen, it would take up | all my time to meet aU the little quibbling arguments of Judge Doug- las to show that th(3 Missouri Compromise was re- pealed by the Compromise of 1850. My own opinion is that a careful investigation of all the arguments to sustain the position that that Com- promise was virtually repealed by the Compro- mise of 1850 would show ttot they are th merest faUaciss. I have the r | MM at Judge Douglas firstlironght into Con\$^^Klie time of the in- troduction of the NebfiWBPw, which in its orlg- ina.I form did not repeal theMissouri Compromise, a,nd ho there expressly stated that he had forborne to do so because it had not been done by the Com- promise of 1850. I close this part of the discus- sion on niy part by asking him the question again "Why when we had peace under the Missouri Com- promise could you not have let it alon'e ?"" In camplivining of what I said in my speech at Sprin^eld" in which he says I accepted my nomix nation for the Seuatorship, (where by the way he is at fault, for if he wUl examine it he will find no acceptance in it;) he again quotes that portion in which I said that "a

house divided against itself cannot stand." Jjet me say a word in regard to that matter. He tries to persuade us that there must be a variety in the different institutions of the States of the Union; that that variety necessarily proceeds from the variety of soil, climate, of the face of the country and the difference in the natural features of the States. I agree to all that. Have these very matters ever produced any difficulty amongst us? Not at all. Have ije ever had any quarrel over the fact that they have laws in Louisiana designed to regulate the commerce that springs from the production of ' sugar ? Or because we have a different class ; relative to the production of flour in this State ? , Have they produced any differences? Not at j all. They are the very cements of this Union. They don't make the house a house divided against itself. They are the props that hold up tbe house and s-,'.stain the Union. But has it been so with this element of slave- ry ? Have we not always had quarrels and dif- ficulties over it? And when will we cease to have quarrels over it? Like causes produce like effects. It IS worth while to observe that we have generally had comparative peace upon the slavery question and that there has been no cause for alarm until it was excited by the ef- fort to spread it into new territory. Whenever it has been limited to its present bounds and there has been no effort to spread it, there has been peace. All the trouble and convulsion has proceeded from eflbrts to spread it over more territory. It was thus at the date of the Missouri Compromise. It was so again with the annexa- tion of Texas ; so with the territory acquired by the Mexican war, and it is so now. Whenever there has been an effort to spread it there has been agitation and resistance. Now I appeal to this audience, (very few of whom are my polit- ical friends,) as national men, whether we have reason to expect that the agitation in regard to this subje<Kwill cease while the causes that tend to reproduce agitation are actively at work? Will not the same cause that produced agitation in 1820 when the Missouri Compromise was formed-that which produced the agitation upon the annexation of Texas and at othef times work out the same results always? Do you think that the nature of man wiU be changed that the same causes that produced agitation at one time wiU not h;--- 'b.. = .!' ft^."-t at another? Tills liVislK en till nbsCTVation yu ^ < 1 I ' I \ I M 4 a^

#

t^l^jsejj;

SB of tli-i Slavery qnestion and mj .>,,^... .. ;"!.; extenas. What right have we tbcu to hops 1 n.it liie trouble will cease that the agitation will . ome to an end-n.itil it shall either be placed back where it originally stood and where the ta- ahers originally placed it, or on the other hand .until it shall entirely master all opposition. This is the view I entertain, and this is the reason 1 entevtaijied it, as Jndge Douglas has read Irom iny Springfield speech. fiow, my friends, there is ono, other thing that I fee! mvself under some sort of obligation to men- tion. Judge Douglas has here to-day in a very rambling way, I was about saying spoken of the platforms lor which he seeks to hold me

responsi- ble. He says, " Why can't you come out and make an open avowal of principles in all places alike ?" and he leads from an advertisement that he says was used to notify the people of a speech to be made by Judge Trumbull at Waterloo. In commenting on it he desires to know whether we cannot speak frankly and manfully as he and his friends do 1 How, I ask, do Mr's friends speak out their own sentiments 1 A Convention of his party in this State met on the 21st of April, at Springfield, and passed a set of resolutions which they proclaim to the country as their platform. This does constitute their platform, and it is because Judge Douglas claims it is his platform that these are his principles and purposes that he has a right to declare he speaks his sentiments "frankly and manfully." On the 9th of June, Col. John Dougherty, Gov. Reynolds and others, calling themselves National Democrats, met at Springfield and adopted a set of resolutions which are as easily understood, as plain and as definite in stating to the country and to the world what they believed in and would stand upon, as Judge Douglas' platform. Now, what is the reason, that Judge Douglas is not willing that Col. Dougherty and Gov. Reynolds should stand upon their own written and printed platform as well as he upon his? Why must he look (rather than their platform when he claims himself to stand by his platform? Again, in reference to our platform; On the 16th of June the Republicans had their Convention and published their platform, which is as clear and distinct as Judge Douglas'. In it they spoke their principles as plainly and as definitely to the world. What is the reason that Judge Douglas is not willing I should stand Upon that platform ? Why must he go around hunting for some one who is supporting me, or has supported me at some time in his life, and who has said something at some time contrary to that platform ? Does Judge regard that rule as a good one ? If it turn out that the rule is a good one for me that I am responsible for any and every opinion that any man has expressed who is my friend then it is a good rule for him. I ask, is it not as good a rule for him as it is for me ? In my opinion, it is not a good rule for either of us. Do you think differently. Judge? Mr. Douglas I do not. Mr. Lincoln Judge Douglas says he does not think differently. I am glad of it. Then can he tell me why he is looking up resolutions of five or six years ago, and insisting that they were my platform, notwithstanding my protest that they are not, and never were my platform, and my pointing out the platform of the State Convention which he delights to say nominated me for the Senate ? I cannot see what he means by parading these resolutions, if it is not to hold me responsible for them in some way. If he says to me here, that he does not hold the rule to be good, one way or the other, I do not comprehend how he could answer me more fully if he answered me at greater length. I will therefore put in as my answer to the resolutions that he has hunted up against me, what I, as a lawyer, would call a good plea to a bad declaration. I understand that it is a maxim of law, that a "poor plea may be a good plea to a bad declaration. I think that the opinions the Judge brings from those who support me, yet differ from me, is a bad declaration against me ; but if I can bring the same things against him, I am putting in a good plea to that kind of declaration, and now I propose to try it. At Freeport Judge Douglas occupied a large part of his time in producing resolutions and documents of various sorts',



as I understood to make me somehow responsible for them; and I propose now doing a little of the same sort of thing for him. In 1850 a very clever gentleman by the name of Thompson Campbell, a personal friend of Judge Douglas and myself, a political friend of Judge Douglas and opponent of mine, was a candidate for Congress in the Galena District. He was interrogated as to his views on this same slavery question. I have here before me the interrogatories and Campbell's answers to them. I will read them: INTERBOFATOBIIS. Ist. Will YOU. if clfctei, vote for and cortially sni)- ri. a MI nroliibiting slavery in the Xerntonea of the '2Jr"wu"?ou vot." for ar,,! siipport a bill abolishing BlflveiT in the Districtof Columbia.^, Id! Wili vou oppose the acimission of any Slave States which miv be formed out of Texas or tlie Terntor es; 4th Will vou vote for and advoca e the rpeal of the Fucit;ve Slave lhw passed at the resent session ot Con ^tth' Will von advocate and vote for the eleo'ion of a SncAerof tlie House of Reofjh^ntativeswlio sba lbe wil- ling A tS'lie Committ ... of that flouse. ..o as to Rive the lreeBateaiheirjust ..xlucence m the business of leEislatlon ?, t,y as to the constitu- 6tn, .Y, -"oneresto prohibit the s^ave trade be- tional -ight 01 -." ,,g .^ to the expediency of cxer tween the Spates, bu. .. ? cislPK that light imi: .aiatei . "*" f""*""^"V.- answer une- To the first and second interrogitoneil, i , (lulvoca'lv In the affirm tive ,, . ., .. To the thir 1 iinterroeMOry r reply, that,I am opposed to theadmisslonofii-iy. more slave States into the Union, th't may be toi-aaedoa of Texan or any other Tern- K the fourth and fifth interrogatories I ilnhesitatiigly answer in tlie aiBrm .tiv. _.,, . ,i, To the sixth interrogatory I reply, that p look's the slave Ptates continue to treat slaves asarli-les of coin- . mm,c. the Coifltltufion confers """" ,S^7-"" * paeslawsreaulatingiha peculnr CuMMt.KCE and that thepro ection ofluman hishts 'moerotively deman Is the inteip"Stioh ofjSv ry oon4imtional means to preveot this most ihumHa fml iniquitous traiiic. T. UAMPIM""LL, I want to say here that ThompstJn Campbell was elected to Congress on that platform as the Democratic candidate in the Galena District, against Martin P. Sweet. Judge Dooglas. Giv ms the date of the letter. Mb. Liscoln. The time Campbell ran was la s 1850. I have not the exact date here. It was some time in 1850 that these interrogatories | were put and the answer given. Campbell was elected to Congress, and served out his term. I ' think a second election came up before he Served out his term and he was not re-elected. Wheth- er defeated or not nominated, I do not know. Mr. Campbell was nominated for re-election by the Democratic party, by acclamation . At the end of his term his very good friend. Judge Douglas, got him a high office from President Pierce, and sent him off to California. Is not ' that the fact? Just at the end of his term in Congress it appeal's thst our mutual friend Judge Douglas got our mutual friend OampbelS a good office, and sent him to California upon it. And not only so, but on the 27th of last month when Judge Douglas and myself spoke at Freeport in joint disciission; there was his same friend Campbell, come all tha way from California, to help the Judge beat me; and there was poor Martin P. Sweet standing on the platform, ffv- ing to help poor me to be elected. ha^Umti . That is trae of ..one of Judge Douglas' friends. So again, in that same race of 1850, there was a Congressional Convention assembled at Joliet, and it nominated B. 8. Molony, for Congress, and unanimously adojited the following resolu- tions: , Hesolved, That

we are uncompromisingly opposed to the extension of slavery; and while we would not make such opposition a ground of interference with the internal affairs of the States where it exists, yet we moderately but firmly insist that it is the duty of Congress to oppose its extension into Territory now free, by all means compatible with the obligations of the Constitution, and with good faith to our sister States; that these principles were confirmed by the Ordinance of 1787, which received the sanction of Thomas Jefferson, who is acknowledged by all to be the great oracle and expounder of our faith. Subsequently, the same interrogatories were propounded to Dr. Molony which had been addressed to Campbell, as above, with the exception of the 10th respecting the Inter-State slave trade, to which Dr. Molony, the Democratic nominee for Congress, replied as follows: 1 received the written interrogatories this day, and as you will see by the answer of the Democrat and Ottawa Free Press, I look at Peru on the 5th and at Ottawa on the 7th. In the affirmative side of interrogatories 1st and 2d. and in relation to the admission of any more Slave States from Free Territory, my position taken at these meetings as correctly reported in said papers was emphatically and distinctly opposed to it. In relation to the admission of any more Slave States from Texas whether I shall go against it or not will depend upon the opinion that I may hereafter form of the true meaning and nature of the resolutions of Annexation. If, by said resolutions, the honor and good faith of the nation is pledged to admit more Slave States from Texas when she (Texas) may apply for the admission of such State then I should, if in Congress, vote for their admission. But if not so required and bound by a sacred contract, then a bill for the admission of more Slave States from Texas would never receive my vote. . . . To your 4th interrogatory I answer most decidedly in the affirmative, and for reasons set forth in my reported remarks at Ottawa last Monday - To your 5th interrogatory I so reply in the affirmative as to correct Mr. Uly, and that I will use my utmost exertions to secure the nomination and election of a man who will accomplish the objects of said interrogatories. I most cordially approve of the resolutions adopted at the union meeting held at Princeton on the 27th September ult. Yours, A. R. S. MOLONY. All I have to say in regard to Dr. Molony, is that he was the regularly nominated Democratic candidate for Congress in his District was elected at that time, at the end of his term was appointed to a Land Office at Danville. (I never heard anything of Judge Douglas' instrumentality in this.) He held this office a considerable time, and when we were at Freeport the other day, there were handbills scattered about notifying the public that after our debate was over, R. S. Maloney would make a Democratic speech in favor of Judge Douglas. That is all I know of my own personal knowledge. It is added here to this resolution, and truly I believe that "Among those who participated in the Joliet Convention, and who supported its nominee, with his platform as laid down in the resolution of the Convention and in his reply 'as above given, we call at random the following names, all of which are recognized at this day as leading Democrats:" "Cook Countt E. B. Williams, Charles McDonsell, Arno Yoss, Thomas Hoyne, Isaac Coolf." I reckon we ought to except Cook. - McKim "F. O. Sherman." "Will Joel A. Matteson, S. W. Bowen." "Kank-B. F. Hall, G. W. Renwick, A. M. Herrington, Blijah Wilcox." "McHenry-W; M. Jackson, Enos W. Smith, "John Teil Donnelly."

"La SALLR John Hise, William KeadioK." William Eeddick! another one of Judge Douglas' friends that stood on the stand with him at Ottawa, at the time the Judge says my knees trembled so that I had to be carried away. '-wb"*~' I The names are all here : " DuPage Nathan Allen." "Delialb-Z. B. Mayo." Here is another set of resolutions which I think are apposite to the matter in hand. On the 28th -of February of the same year, a Democratic District Convention was held at Na- pervillB, to nominate a candidate for Circuit J'udge. Among the delegates were Bowen and Kelly, of Will; Captain Naper, U. H. Cody, Nathan Allen, of DuPage ; W. M. Jaekson, J. IVI. Strode; P. W. Piatt aud Enos W. Smith, of McHenry ; J, Ilorsman and others, of Winneba; go. Col. .Strode presided over the Convention." The following -resolut-ions were unanimously adopted the first on motion of P. W. Platt, the second on motion of William M. Jackson. Resolved, That this C invent'oa is in favor of the tVil- mot Proviso, botti la Principle and Practice, s.ni thsX we know of no good reason why any permn. shouM op- pose'he larsest latitude iu Free Soil, Free Territory A-iX Free Speech. m i ' 1 i

^jj^t^

-^*^ftfeS^' S^ /

/ llesolved; Thiit in th^, opinion o' tms v^oaveiii^ou the 4 time tiasarrued when all iien should be free, whites as well as others. Judge Douglas What is the date of those re- solutions ? Mr. Lincoln I understand it was in 1850, but I do not know it. I do not state a thing and say I know it, wlien I do not. But I have the highest belief that this is so. I know of no way to arrive at the conclusion that there is an error in it. I mean to put a case no stronger than the trnth will allow. But what I was going to comment upon is an extract from a newspaper in DeKalb County, and it strikes me as being rather singu- lar, I confess, under the circumstances. There la a Judge Mayo in that county, who is a candidate for the Legislature, for the purpose, if he secures his election, of helping to re-elect Judge Douglas. He ia the editor of a newspaper DeKalb County Sentinel , and in that paper I find the extract I am going to read. It is part of an editorial article in which he was electioneering as fiercely as he could for Judge Douglas and against me. It was a curious thing, I think, to be in such a paper. I will agree to that, and the Judge may make the most of it: " Our education has been such, that we huve evfr ben rather in favor ot tlte equaUtv o/ me blackKj lIMt m. th(tt they slwvM enjoy all the privileaes o/tlis whites where they reside. We are aware that this is not a vt ry poimlar doctrine. Wf have had many a crniab with s >me who are row strong'R(Du>licanB,'we takins the broad ground . f etiuallty and they the oiincsite ground. " We were broust up i i a State where bl-icks were v'er3, and we do not know of any inoonvienien'e r' suit, ine from it, thouEh perhaps it would oot work aswel where the blacks are more numerous, we have no doubt_ of the right of the whites to guard aoalnst such an evil, if it is one. Our opinion is that it would be be^t for all f OQ- cerned to 1 aethe

colored population in a State by them- selves Inthislag'eewlth him ; but it with n the ums- dtctirn of the United f taies. we say by all tneanstheu should hamtherictld to 1mm thetr Henulors andBe- presentativesin Congress, andto mtejor rresiami. Witii us 'worth makes the man, andwwtof itthe fellow. ou, oU^i^V*^'^ '^ We have seen many a ' nigger' that we thousht more of than some white men." That is one of Judge Douglas' friends. Now I do not want to leave myself in an attitude where I can be misrepresented, so I will say I do not think the Judge is responsible for this? article; but he ia quite as respon.^ible f:r it- as I would be if one of my friends had said it.; I think that is fair enough. ^SMBWftl I have here also a set of resolutions paiMd by a Democratic State Convention in Judge Doug- las' own good old State of Vermont, that 1 think ought to be good for him too: ltesolAted, That l'berty is a rjght.inberent and inaliena- ble in man. and tha^ herein all men are equal, Resoised, Toat we cla'm no authority ia the Federal Gover,>ment to abolish slavery in i he several btates, but we do claim for it constitutional power er^etually to nro- hitiit the introdu tion of slavery into territory now free, and abohsh it wherever, under the jui'isdKtion cf Con- gress it exists. liesolved. That this power ought immediately to be ex- erci-edinproh'.biting the introduction and existence of slavery in New Mexico and California, in Hbohshini? sla- very . nd the slave trade ia the Dis rict of Columbia, oq the high seas, and waerever else, under the Constitution, it can be reache t. liesol'Oed That no more slave States should be admit-^ ted into t, e Federal Union. ^ Besolved. That the Government ought to return to its ancient policy, not to extend, nationalize or eucourage, but to limit, localize and discourage slavery. At Freeport I answered several interrogatories that had been propounded to me by Judge Doug- las at the Ottawa meeting. The Judge has yet not seen fit to find any fault witli the position that I took in regard to those seven interrogatories, which were certainly broad enough, in all con- science, to cover the entire ground, la my an- swers, which have been printed, and all have had the opportunity of seeing, I take the ground that those who elect me must expect that I will do nothing which is not in accordance with tnose answers. I have some right to assert that Judge Douglas has no fault to find with them. But he chooses to still try to thrust me upon different ground without paying any attention 11 my an- swers, the obtaining of which from me cost him so much trouble and concern. At the same time, I propounded four interrogaitories to him, claiming it as a right that he should answer as many inter- rogatories for me as I did for him, and I would re- servo myself for a future installment when I got them ready. The Judge in answering me upon that occasion, put in what I suppose he intends as answers to all lour of my interrogatories. The first one of these interrogatories I have before.me, and it is in these woords: Question 1, Tf the people of Kansas shall, by means entirely unobjectionable in ail other respects. dupt a Soate vtoii titu,ion, and ask admission into the Union un- der it, ft^o/e they have the requisite number of inhabi- tants aciording lo the Hnglish Bill some ninety-th.ee thousand will you vote to a imit them ? As I read the Judge's answer in the newspa- per, and as I remember it as pronounced at the time, he does not give any answer which is equi- valent to yes or no I will or I wont. He an- swers at very considerable length, rather quar- reling with me for asking the question, and insisting that Judge Trumbuli had

done some- thing that I ought to say something about; and finally getting out such statements as induce me to infer that he means to be understood he will, in that supposed case, vote for the admission of Kansas. I only bring this forward now for the purpose of saying that if he chooses to put a dilierent construction upon his answer he may do it. But if he does not, I shall from this time forward assume that he will vote for the admis- sion of Kansas n.n l^rtliin | | Hi the English bill, 'Ae has the right to remove any misunderstand- f- . - have. I only mention it now that 1 Idg 1 n>.-^ ^ - assume this to be the true con- may hereaitey . , ^ jj- ^^ ^^^^ ^^^ ^^^ choose struotion of his answv.,' to correffit the. r propouaded The second Jfitwrogatory thai . P^P'''''''''' to him, was this; ' , "Q 2 Can the people of a tTnitci! States Territory, in an? lawful way, against the wish of any cilizin of the United States, exc ude slavery from its limUs prior to' tfile formation of a Stale Constttution ?" To this Judge Douglas answered that they can lawfully exclude slavery from the Territory prior to the formation of a constitution. He goes on to tell us how it ean be done. As 1 understand him, he holds that it Can be done by the Terri- torial Legislature refusing to make any enact- meSts for the protection of slavery in the Ter- ritory, and fiapeciaUy by adoptingj unfriendly legislation to it. For the sake ot clearness 1 state it again ; that they can exclude slavery from the Ternton-, 1st. by withholdinfi wiia"t he assumes to be au indispensable assistance to it in the way of legislation; and 2d, by un- friendly legislation. If I rightly, understand him, I wish to ask your attention for a while to ; his position. In tlje,first place, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that any Congres- . * sional prohibitiin of Slavery in the Territories is uncenstitutional that they have reached this proposition as a conclusion from their former l proposition that the Constitution of the United ^ States expressly recognizes property in slaves, l and froifi that other constitutional provision that l no person shall bo deprived of property without ^ due process of law. HeCce they reach the con- ' elusion that as the Constitution of th8 United ' j States expressly recognizes property in elayes, and prohibits any person from being deprived of property without due process of law, to pass an act of Congress by wbjoh a man who owned ' a slave on one side of a line i*c*aId be deprived of him if he took him on the other side, ia de- priving him of that property without due pfo- . cese ol law. Tljatl understand to be the de- cision of the SimfStoe Court. 1 understand also that Judge DoSghis adheres most firmly to that decision; and the difficulty is, how is it possible for any power to exclude slavery from the Ter ritory unless in violation of that decision 1 That is the difhculty. In the Senate of the United States, in 1856, Judge TrambuUin a speech, substantially if not directly, put the same interrogatory to Judge Douglas,,as to whether the people of a Territory had the lawfal power to exclude slavery prior to the formation of a j^onstitution ? Judge DoUgr^ las then answered at considerable length, and his answer will be found in the Congressional Globe, under date of June i)th, 1856, The Judge said that whether the people could exclude slavery prior to the formation of a constitution or not was a question to be decided iy the Su- preme Court. He put that proposition, as will be seen by the Congressional (}lobe, in a variety of forms, all running to the same thing in sub- stance that it was a question for the Supreme Court. I maintain that when he says, afier the Supreme Court have decided the question,

that the people may yet exclude slavery by any means whatever, he does virtually say, that it is not a question for the Supreme Court. He shifts his ground. I appeal to you whether he did not say it was a question for the Supreme Court. Has not the Supreme Court decided that question? When he now says the people may exclude slavery, does he not make it a question for the people? Does he not virtually shift his ground and say that it is not a question for the Court, but for the people? This is a very simple proposition a very plain and naked one. It seems to me that there is no difficulty in deciding it. In a variety of ways he said that it was a question for the Supreme Court. He did not stop then to tell us that whatever the Supreme Court decides the people can by withholding necessary "police regulations" keep slavery out. He did not make any such answer. I submit to you now, whether the new state of the case has not induced the Judge to sheer away from his original ground, *fiitqi^iaase*. Would not this be the impression of every fair-minded man? I hold that the proposition that slavery cannot enter a new country without police regulations is historically false. It is not true at all. I hold that the history of this country shows that the institution of slavery was originally planted upon this continent without these "police regulations" which the Judge now thinks necessary for the actual establishment of it. Not only so, but is there not another fact how came this Dred Scott decision to be made? It was made upon the case of a negro being taken and actually held in slavery in Minnesota Territory, claiming his freedom because the act of Congress prohibited his being so held there. Will the Judge pretend that Dred Scott was not held there without police regulations? There is at least one matter of record as to his having been held in slavery in the Territory, not only without police regulations, but in the teeth of Congressional legislation supposed to be valid at the time. This shows that there is vigor enough in Slavery to plant itself in a new country even against unfriendly legislation. It takes not only law but the enforcement of law to keep it out. That is the history of this country upon the subject. I wish to ask one other question. It being understood that the Constitution of the United States guarantees property in slaves in the Territories, if there is any infringement of the right of that property, would not the United States Courts, organized for the government of the Territory, apply such remedy as might be necessary in that case? It is admitted by the Courts, that there is no remedy without its remedy; and the Courts have a remedy for whatever is acknowledged and treated as a wrong. / Again: I will ask you my friends if you were elected members of the Legislature, what would be the first thing you would have to do before entering upon your duties? Swear to support the Constitution of the United States. Suppose you believe, as Judge Douglas does, that the Constitution of the United States guarantees to your neighbor the right to hold slaves in that Territory that they are his property how can you clear your oaths unless you give him such legislation as is necessary to enable him to enjoy that property? What do you understand by supporting the Government of a State or of the United States? Is it not to give such constitutional helps to the rights established by that Constitution as may be practically needed? Can you, if you swear to support the Constitution, and believe that the Constitution establishes a right, clear your oath, without giving it support? Do you

support the Constitution if, knowing or believing there is a right established under it which needs
SDeciflo legislation, lyou withhold thalj legislation? Do you not violate and disregard youi oath ?
iS^ conceive ot nothing plainer in the world. Tnere can be nothing in the words "support the consti-
tution," if you may run counter to it by refusing support to any ri.ght established mider the const!- J^r

^

^

Hi ...^u**- -*Mii**j**p

^ 11

i \v

>-<i^Ke:i; vj^ Wy 4- I say here will hold with still 'lu^iM u i-c iif^^.iinsi the Judge's dttc^rine of "un-
friendly legislation." How could you, having sworn to support the Constitution, and believing it
gaaraiii. ;d the right to hold slaves in the Ter- ritories, assist in legislation intended to defeat that
fight ? That would be violating yonr own view of the constitution. Not only so, but if you were to do
so, how long would it take the courts to hold your votes unconstitutional and void? Not a moment. /
f^ Lastly I would ask^is not Congress, Itself, ff under obligation to give legislative support to V.
any right that is established under the United States Constitution ? I repeat the question is not
Congress, itself, bound to give legislative supyort to any right ^hat is established in the United States
Constitution ? A member of Con- gress swears to support the Constitution of the Un ted States, and
if he sees a right established by that Constitution which needs specific legis- lative protection, can
he clear his oath without giving that protection? Let me ask you why many of us who are opposed
to slavery upon prin- ciple" give our acquiescence to a fugitive slave law? Why do we hold ourselves
under obligations to pass such a law, and abide by it when it is passed ? Because the Constitution
makes pro- vision that the owners of slaves shall have the right to reclaim them. It gives the right to
reclaim slaves, and that right is, as Judge 'll'Douglas says, a barren right, unless there is negislation
that will enforce it. The mere declalation " No person held to ser- " vice or labor in ope Sta*c under
the laws there- " of, e.scapiug into an other, shall in consequence " of any law or regulation therein
be discharged " from suchj sei-vice or 1 ibor, but shall be deliv- " ered up ou claim of the party
to whom such " service or labor may be due" is powerless without specific legislation to enforce
it. Now on what ground would a member of Congress who is opposed to slavery in the abstract
vote for a fugitive law, as I would deem .it my duty to do? Be- cause there is a Constitutional right,
which needs legislation to enforce it. And although it is distasteful to me, I have sworn to support
the Constitution, and having so sworn I cannot concieve that I do support it if I withheld from that
right any necessary legislation to make it practical. And if that is true in regard to a fugitive slave

law, is the right to have fugitive slaves reclaimed any better fixed in the Constitution than the right to hold slaves in the Territories? For this decision is a just exposition of the Constitution as Judge Douglas thinks. Is the one right any better than the other? Is there any man who while a member of Congress would give support to the one any more than the other? If I wished to refuse to give legislative support to slave property in the Territories, if a member of Congress, I could not do it holding the view that the Constitution establishes that right. If I did it at all, it would be because I deny that this decision properly construes the Constitution. But if I acknowledge with Judge Douglas that this decision properly construes the Constitution, I cannot conceive that I would be less than a perjured man if I should refuse in Congress to give such protection to that property as in its nature it needed. At the end of what I have said here I propose to give the Judge my fifth interrogatory which he may take and answer at his leisure. My fifth interrogatory is this: If the slaveholding citizens of a United States Territory should need and demand Congressional legislation for the protection of their slave property in such territory, would you, as a member of Congress, vote for or against such legislation? Judge Douglas Will you repeat that? I want to answer that question. Me. Lincoln----- If the slaveholding citizens of a United States Territory should need and demand Congressional legislation for the protection of their slave property in such Territory, would you, as a member of Congress vote for or against such legislation? I am aware that in some of the speeches Judge Douglas has made, he has spoken as if he did not know or think that the Supreme Court had decided that a territorial Legislature cannot exclude slavery. Precisely what the Judge would say upon the subject whether he would say definitely that he does not understand they have so decided, or whether he would say he does not understand that the Court have so decided, I do not know; but I know that in his speech at Springfield he spoke of it as a thing they had not decided yet; and in his answer to me at Freeport, he spoke of it so far again as I can comprehend it, as a thing that had not yet been decided. Now I hold that if the Judge does entertain that view I think he is not mistaken in so far as it can be said that the Court has not decided anything save the mere question of jurisdiction. I know the legal arguments that can be made that after a court has decided that it cannot take jurisdiction of a case, it then has decided it, and that is the end of it. A judgment can be made in favor of that plausible. Judge Douglas has proposed, but, I think, that the court went said in one of its opinions forward like honest men, and, I think, in all the points in the case. It is a power of the Territorial Legislature to exclude slavery is one of them, as also the one that the Missouri Compromise was null and void. They are both extra-judicial or neither is according as the Court held that they had no jurisdiction in the case between the parties, because of want of capacity of one party to maintain a suit in that Court. I want, if I have sufficient time, to show that the Court did pass its opinion, but that is the only thing actually done in the case. If they did not decide, they showed what they were ready to decide whenever the matter was before them. What is that opinion.' After having argued that Congress had no power to pass a law excluding

slavery from a United States Territory, they then used language to this effect: that inasmuch as Congress itself could not exercise such a power, it followed as a matter of course that it could not authorize a territorial government to exercise it, for the Territorial Legislature can do no more than Congress could do. Thus it expressed its opinion emphatically against the power of a Territorial Legislature to exclude slavery, leaving us in just as little doubt on that point as upon any other point they really decided. Now, my fellow citizens, I will detain you only a little while longer. My time is very nearly out. I find a report of a speech made by Judge Douglas at Joliet, since we last met at Freeport—published I believe in the Missouri Republican on the 9th of this month, in which Judge Douglas says: A Yankee knows at Ottawa, I read this platform, and asked Mr. Uim if he concurred in each and all of the principles set forth in it. He would not answer these questions. At last I said frankly. I wish you to answer them, because when I get them up here where the color of your principles is a little darker than in Egypt. I intend to trot you down to Jonesboro. He very notice that I was going to take him down to Egypt: made him tremble in his knees so that he had to be carried from the platform. He laid up seven days, and in the meantime held a consultation with his political physicians, they had Lovejoy and Painsworth and all the leaders of the Abolition party, they consulted it all over, and at last Lincoln came to the conclusion that he would answer, so he came up to Freeport, the last day, and now that statement altogether furnishes a subject for philosophical contemplation. I suppose that I have been treating it in that way, and I have really come to the conclusion that I can explain it in no other way than by believing the Judge is crazy. Beware of him. If he was in his right mind, I cannot conceive how he would have naked disgusting the four or five thousand of his own friends who stood there, and knew, as to my having been carried from the platform, that there was not a word of truth in it Judge Douglas Didn't they carry you off? Me. Lincoln There; that question illustrates the character of this man Douglas, exactly. He smiles now and says, "Didn't they carry you off?" But he said then, "He had to be carried off;" and he said it to convince the country that he had so completely broken me down by his speech that I had to be carried away. Now he seeks to dodge it, and asks, "Didn't they carry you off?" Yes, they did. But, Judge Douglas, why didn't you tell the truth? We are all well and the MS. I would like to know why you didn't tell the truth about it. I am afraid. And then again, "He laid up seven days." He puts this in print for the people of the country to read as a serious document. I think if he had been in his sober senses he would not have risked that barefacedness in the presence of thousands of his own friends, who knew that I made speeches within six of the seven days at Henry, Marshall County; Augusta, Hancock County, and Macomb, McDonough County, including all the necessary travel to meet him again at Freeport at the end of the six days. Now, I say, there is no charitable way to look at that statement, except to conclude that he is actually crazy. There is another thing, in that statement that alarmed me very greatly as he states it, that he was going to "trot me down to Egypt." Thereby he would have you to infer that I would not come to Egypt unless he forced me that I could not be got here, unless he, giant-like, had hauled me down here, Illinois. That statement he makes, too, in the teeth of the



knowledge that I had made the stipulation to come down here, and that he himself had been very
reluctant to enter into the stipulation. HiiiM>rTrMgtsKgM'J- ^^'^^<' ^^^^ ^'^ t^^i^' Judge Douglas,
when he made that statement must have been crazy, and wholly out of his sober senses, or else he
would have known that when he got me down here that promise that windy promise of his powers
to annihilate me, wouldn't amount to anything. 1 Now, how little do I look like being carried away
trembling? Let the Judge go on, and after he is done with his half hour, I want you all, if I can't go
home myself, to let me stay and rot here; and if anything happens to the Judge, if I cannot carry
him to the hotel and put him to bed, let me stay here and rot.' t^t<i**ghi>'i>ii.J I say, then, there is
something extraordinary in this statement? ;I ask you if you know any other living man who would
make such a statement? -O-reBPet'^Aftaj'^ ^BSfett^eTthereTif he would do such a thing?.tiOTPy
iWppMificijltaad. a,ttd ia,jd.:otbiB^. Would he send that out and have his men take it as the truth?
Did the Judge talk of trotting me down to Egypt to scare me to death? Why, I know this people better
than he does. I was raised just a little east of here. I am a part of this people. But the Judge was
raised further north, and perhaps he has some horrid idea of what this people might be induced
to do. \ Rainrn pf-iftd"-''-*'''''-''''**'^''''''''**''''** J But really I have talked about this mat-
ter perhaps longer than I ought, for It is, no great thing, and yet the smallest are often the most difficult things
to deal with. The Judge has set about serious trying to make, the impression that when we meet
different places I am literally in his clutch"* ",**** 1 ani a poor, helpless, decrepit mouse, and I
can do nothing at all. This is one of the ways he has taken to create that impression. I don't know
any other way to meet it, except this. 1 ,V^ *' want to quarrel with him to call him a) 'ar but when I
come square up to him I don't know what else to call him, if I must tell the truth peace, and reserve
all my fighting powers for necessary occasions. My time, now, is very nearly out, and I give up the
trifle that is left to the Judge to let him set my knees trembling again, if he can. I I imitrtir*' " " ***
i.iMit,f.at.a>iM

1

'-t COOGIAS REPLT.^_ - on agah taking the sla'jo - . - ' u,i with thundering appiause. -fIWHW;
My friends, while I am very grateful to you for the enthusiaem which you show for me, I will say in
all candor, that your quietness will be much more agreeable than your applause, inasmuch as you
de- prive me ot some pah of my time whenever you cheer. (A4i-wgfi"S""^<""*i ""^ wnn^'^iIW'fUyt.
1 will commence where Mr. Lincoln left off, and make a remark upon this serious complamt of his
about mv speech at Joliet. I did say there in a playfu! manner that when I put these questions to MrI
Lincoln at Ottowa he tailed to answer, and that he trembled and had to be carried off the stand,
and required seven days to get up his reply. (Laujfk- ^0,) That he did not walk off from that stand
he mTI' cot deny. That when the crowd went away from the stand with me, a few persons earned
him home on their shoulders and laid him down, he will admit. ^Wtts'of 1*tf9bw) I wish to say to

you that whenever I degrade my friends and myself by allowing them to carry me on their backs along through the public streets when I am able to walk I am willing to be deemed crazy. (V. AU-swM, ioaaails in a r8sejj, #..hffc'WBr.) I did not say Xv^erTtiSfrm or he beat me in the argument. It is true I put these questions to him, and I put them not as mere idle questions, but showed that I based them upon the creed of the Black Republican party as declared by their conventions in that portion of the State which he depends upon to elect him and desired to know whether he endorsed that creed. He would not answer. When I reminded him that I intended bringing him into Egypt and renewing my questions if he refused to answer, he then consulted and did get up his answers one week after answers which I may refer to in a few minutes and show you how equivocal they are. My object was to make him avow whether or not he stood by the platform of his party; the resolutions I then read, and upon which I based my questions, had been adopted by his party in the Calena Congressional district and the Chicago and Bloomington Congressional districts, composing a large majority of the counties in this State that give Republican or Abolition majorities. Mr. Lincoln cannot and will not deny that the doctrines laid down in these resolutions were in substance put forth in Lovejoy's resolutions which were voted for by a majority of his party, some of them, if not all, receiving the support of every man in the party. Hence, I laid a foundation for my question to him before I asked him whether that was or was not the platform of his party. He says that he answered my questions. One of them was whether he would vote to admit any more slave States into the Union. The creed of the Republican party as set forth in the resolutions of their various conventions was that they would under no circumstances vote to admit another slave State. It was put forth in the Lovejoy resolutions in the legislature. It was put forth and passed in a majority of all the counties of this State which give Abolition or Republican majorities, and it is the law of the legislature of that school of politics. I had a great view of it at the time. He is in no existence. It is so understood there, and you cannot expect an answer from him on a case that applies to any one territory, or applies to the new States which by compact we are pledged to admit out of Texas, when they have the requisite population and desire admission. I submit to you whether he has made a frank answer, so that you can tell how he would vote in any one of these cases. "He would be sorry to be put in the position." Why would he be sorry to be put in this position if his duty required him to give the vote? If the people of a territory ought to be permitted to come into the Union as a State, with slavery or without it, as they pleased, why not give the vote admitting them cheerfully? If in his opinion they ought not to come in with slavery, even if they wanted to, why not say that he would cheerfully vote against their admission? His intention is that conscience would not let him vote. No, and he would be sorry to do that which his conscience would compel him to do as an honest man. In regard to the contract or bargain between Trumbull, the Abolitionist, and him, whether he would vote for or against the admission of another slave State, if the people wanted it. He first answered that he was not bound on the subject, and then said. In regard to the other question of whether I am pledged

to the admission of any more slave states to the Union, I state to you very frankly that I would be exceedingly sorry ever to be put in the position of having to pass on that question. (*^ dmibt " aMwtbwr- Mr. Liucolulook* svf:ey 4s?*j:StSr the mauWho said "no d^afet." "I should be exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another slave state admitted into the Union; but I must add that if slavery shall be kept out of the territories during the territorial existence of any one given territory, and then the people, having a fair chance and a free field when they come to adopt a constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as adopt a slave constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative. If we own the country, but to admit them into the "Sow'lnaly.e that answer. In '^^^fj'^^^^Pj^^^"^^"^^" sava he would be exceedingly sorry to be put in a position where he would have to vote on the question of the admission of a slave state. ""7 '^^ a candidate for the Senate if he would be sorry to be put in that position? I trust the people of Illinois will not put him in a position where he would have to vote on the question of the admission of a slave state. What is that contingency? If it is: LZuV ,fe^ .TrXp- 'b^e tVdTartVa^lm t%r^r"kip\UTo^ .%, Si^s^w^L^v^SHS t 'Kt^s:TTZ 1 fdo s^'no^'rweT 'and tItis tSe c^n^on of every territory we have now, 7 %!averv is not kept out of Kansas by act of Congress "Si^rsla^er^U her people may desire he will not answer, and you have not got an answer from him'. In Nebraska slavery is not prohibited by act of Congress, but the people are allowed, under the Nebraska bill, to do as they please on the subject; and when I ask him whether he will vote to admit Nebraska with a slave constitution if her people desire it, he will not answer. So with New Mexico, Washington Territory, Arizona, and the four new States to be admitted from Texas. You cannot get an answer from him to these questions. His answer only applies to a given case, to a condition of things which he knows does not exist in any one territory in the Union. He tries to give you to understand that he would allow the people to do as they please, and yet he dodges the question as to every territory in the Union. I now ask why cannot Mr. Lincoln answer to each of these territories? He it is that has done it, and he will not do it. The Abolitionists no North understand that this answer is made denies: I wish to say that the charge can be proved by notorious historical facts. Trumbull, Lovejoy, Giddings, Fred Douglass. Hale, and Banks, were traveling the State at that time making speeches on the same side and in the same cause with him. ; He contents himself with the simple denial that no such thing occurred. Does he deny that he, and Trumbull, and Breese, and Giddings, and Chase, and Fred Douglass, and Lovejoy, and those Abolitionists and deserters from the Democratic party, did make speeches all over this State in the same common cause? Does he deny that Jim Matheny was then and is now his confidential friend, and does he deny that Matheny made the charge of the bargain and fraud in his own language as I have read it from his printed speech. Matheny spoke of his own personal knowledge of that bargain existing between Lincoln, Trumbull, and the Abolitionists. He still remains Lincoln's confidential friend, and is now a candidate for Congress, and is canvassing the Springfield district for Lincoln. I assert that I can prove the charge to be true in detail if I can ever get it where I can summon and compel the attendance of witnesses. I have the statement of another man to the same effect as

that made by Matheny, which I am not permitted to use yet, but Jim Matheny is a good witness on that point, and the history of the country is conclusive upon it. That Lincoln up to that time had been a Whig, and then undertook to Abolition- ize the Whigs iiad bring them into the Abolition camp, is beyond denial; that Trumbull up to that time had been a Democrat, and deserted, and undertook to Abolitionize the Democracy, and take them into the Abolition camp, i- beyond denial; that they are both now active, leading, distinguish- ed members of this Abolition RepuTjhcan party, in full communion, is a fac-. that cannot be ques- tioned or denied. . But Lincoln is not willing to be responsible tor the creed of his party. He complains because 1 hold him responsible, and iu order to avoid the is- sue, he attempts to show that individuals in the Democratic party, manv years.ago, expressed abo- lition sentiments. It is true that Tom Campbell when a candidate for Congress in 1850, pnbliahed the letter which Lincoln read. When 1 asked Lin- coln for the date of that letter he could not. give it. The date of the letter has been suppressed by other speakers who have used it, though 1 take it tor granted that Lincoln did not know the date, it tu will take the trouble to examine, he will find that the letter was published only two days before the election, and was never seen until after it, except in one county. Tom Cam bell would have been beat to death by the Democr-ritic party if that letter had been made public 10 his district. As to Mol- lonv it is true he uttered sentiments of the kind re- , ferred to by Mr. Lincoln, and the best democrats would not vote for him for that reason I returned | from Washington after the passage of tbe Compro^ : mise measures in 1850, and when I found Molony running under John W-t-orth's tutelage, and on his platform, 1 denouiv; n, and declared tr, he was no democrat. ..y speech at Chicago iuBt before the election .ar, year, I went before toe infuriated people ol that city and vindicated tne I Compromise measures of 1860. Remember the city ! council had passed resolutions nullifying acts ot Congress and instructing the police to withhold ' their assistance from the execution of the laws, and as I was the only man in the city ot Chicago wno was reapousible for the passage of the Compromise measures, 1 went before the crowd, justified each and every one ol those measures, and let it be said to the eternal honor of t,he people of Chicago, that when they were convinced by my exposition of those measures that they were right end they had done wrong iu opposing them, they repealed their nullifying resolutions and declared that they would acquiesce m and support the laws of the land. These facts are well known, and Mr. Lincoln can only get up individual instances, dating back to 1849, 'so, which are contradicted by the whole tenor ol the democratic creed. . . . , But Mr Lincoln does not want to be held respon- sible for the -Black Republican doctrine of no more slave States. Farnsworth is t:ie candidate of his party to-day in the Chicago district, and he made a speech in the last Congress inwhich hecalled upon God to palsy his right arm if he ever voted for the admission of another slave State, whether the peo- pie wanted it or not. Lovejoy is making speeches all over the State for Lincoln now, and taking ground against anymore sl-<.ve States. Washburne, the Black Rcpubli'can candidate for Congress in the Galena district,- is making speeches m favor of this same abolition platform declaring no more slave States. Why are men running for Congress in the northern districts,

and taking that abolition plat- form for their guide, when Mr. Lincoln does not want to be held to it down here in Egypt and in the centre of the State, and objects to it so as to get votes here. (*te! Se^S*?) .p' ' f "f .if' Lincoln that his party m the northern part of the State hold to that abolition platform, and that if they do not in the south and iu the centre they pre_ sent the extraordinary spectacle of a hou^divided against itself, and hence cannot stand, ^immm.) I miw bring down upon him the vengeance of his own scriptural quotation, and give it a more appropriate application than he did, when 1 say to him that his partv, ab.diti^in ir. :!iirid rf th? State and opposed w i..i,,j,a0tMk-- *mmikiMm^mitm

r-^mmfmm J^* J. m

.><-iyi'Wi iiiimii' '-^fesej*: \ . 1 x \ w> it in the other, iR a house divided aga'usi. iiseit, and cannot stand, and ought not to stand, tor it at-, tempts to cheat the American people out of their votes by disguising its sentiments, C^m^^mk.) / Mr. Lincoln attempts to cover up and get over /his abolitionism by telling you that he was raised a little east of you, (kmgbMf,) beyond the Wabash in Indiana, and he thinks that makes a mighty sound and good man of him on all these ques tions. I do not know that the place where a man is born or raised has much to do with his political principles. The worst Abo- litionists I have ever known in Illinois have been men who have sold their slaves in Alebama and Kentucky, and have come iiere and turned Aboli- tionists whilst spending the money got ioj* the ne- grues they sold, (li9S:jffi4ajj(Ww*>) and I dq not know that an Abolitionist from Indiana >a K^n tucky ought to have any more credit becaust be was born and raised among slaveholder^ . ^" hit,4,Me^aeuiahfii.) I do not li,now that a native of Kentucky is more excusable because raised an:ioni>, slaves, his lather and mother having owned slaves, he comes to Illinois, turns Abolitionist, and slanders the graves of his father and mother, and breathes curses upon the instituiions under which he was born, and his father and mother.bred. Trne, X was not born out west here. I was born away down in Yankee land, i(| mid>) I was born in a val- ley in Vermont' (itJS^^, with the high mountains around me. I love the old green mountains and valleys of Vermont, where I was born, and where 1 played in my childhood. I went up to visit them, some seven or eight years ago, for the first time for twenty odd years. When I got there thsytreac, , ' very kindly.' They invited me to tlie commencement of their college, placed me on the seats with ifeir distinguished guests, and conferred upon me the degree of L. L. D. in latin, (doctor of laws,) the same as they did on old Hickory, at Cambridge, many years ago, and I give you my word and hon- or I understood just as much pf the latin as ^e did. ffiT-nghitT".il When they got through corvfring the honorary degree, they called upon me lor a speech, and 1 got up with my heart full and sweit lag with gratitude for their kindness,. and I said to lhera, '* My friends, Vermont is the roost glorious spot on the face of this globe for a man to be born in, provided be emigrates when be is very young. (&arioiis :ShiifsoMM^jW>r.) I emigrated whetFTIvas very young. I came out here when I was a boy,

and I found my mind liberalized, and my opinions enlarged when I got on these broad prairies, with only the Heavens to bound my vision, instead of having them circumscribed by the little row of hills that surrounded the valley where I was born. But, I discard all flings of the land where I was born. I wish to be judged by my principles, by those great public measures and constitutional principles upon which the peace, the happiness and the perpetuity of this republic now rest. Mr. Lincoln has framed another question, proposed it to me, and desired my answer. As I have said before, I did not put a question to him that I did not first lay a foundation for by showing that it was a part, of the platform of the party whose votes he is now seeking, adopted in a majority of the counties where he now hopes to get a majority, I and supported by the candidates of his party now running in those counties. But I will answer his question. It is as follows: "If the slaveholding citizens of a United States territory should need and demand congressional legislation for the introduction of their 'slave property in such territory, would you, as a member of Congress, vote for or against such legislation?" I answer him that it is a fundamental article in the Democratic creed that there should be non-interference and non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States or territories. Mr. Lincoln could have found an answer to his question in the Cincinnati platform, if he had desired it. The Democratic party have always stood by that great principle of non-interference and non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States and territories alike, and I stand on that platform now. Now I desire to call your attention to the fact that Lincoln did not define his own position in his own question. How does he stand on that question? He put the question to me at Freeport whether or not I would vote to admit Kansas into the Union before she had 98,420 inhabitants. I answered him at once that it having been decided that Kansas had now population enough for a slave State, she had population enough for a free State, ("I wish to see it as it was for 11 years ago against it originally. Is every man in this land allowed to resist decisions he does not like, and only support those that meet his approval? What are important courts worth unless their decisions are binding on all good citizens? It is the fundamental principles of the judiciary that its decisions are final. It is created for that purpose so that when you cannot agree among yourselves on a dispute, you appeal to the judicial tribunal which steps in and decides for you, and that decision is then binding on every good citizen. It is the law of the land just as much with Mr. Lincoln against it as for it. And yet he says that if that decision is binding he is a perjured man if he does not vote for a slave code in the different territories of this Union. Well, if you (turning to Mr. Lincoln) are not going to resist the decision, if you obey it, and do not intend to array mob law against the constitutional authorities, then, according to your own statement, you will be a perjured man if you do not vote to establish slavery in these territories. My objection is, that even taking Mr. Lincoln's view that the individual recognizes the right of a man to carry his slaves into the territories of the United States, yet after he gets there he needs affirm native law to make that right of any value, the same doctrine not only applies to slave property, out

all other kinds of property. Chief Justice Taney places it upon the ground that slave property is on an equal footing with other property. Suppose one of your merchants should move to Kansas and open a liquor store; he has a right to take groceries and liquors there, but the mode of selling them, and the circumstances under which they shall be sold, and all the remedies must be prescribed by local legislation, and if that, is unfriendly it will drive him out just as effectually as if there was a constitutional provision, against the sale of liquor. So the absence of local legislation to encourage and support, slave property in a territory excludes it practically just as effectually as if there was a positive constitutional provision against it. Hence, I assert that under the Dred Scott decision you cannot maintain slavery a day in, a territory where there is an unwilling people and unfriendly legislation. If the people are opposed to it, your right is a barren, worthless, useless right, and if they are for it, they will support and encourage it. We come right back, therefore, to the practical question, if the people of a territory want slavery they will have it, and if they do not want it you cannot force it on them. And this is the practical question, the great principle upon which our institutions rest. I am willing to take the decision of the Supreme Court as it was pronounced by that august tribunal without stopping to inquire whether it would have decided that way or not, I have had many a decision made against me on questions of law which I did not like, but I was bound by them just as much as if I had had a hand in making them, and approved them. Did you ever see a lawyer or a client lose his case that he approved the decision of the court. They always think the decision unjust when it is given against them. In a government of laws like ours we must sustain the constitution as our fathers made it, and maintain the rights of the States as they are guaranteed under the constitution, and then we will have peace and harmony between the different States and sections of this land. I answered the question unequivocally, and then I asked him whether he would vote for or against the admission of Kansas before she had 93,420 inhabitants, and he would answer me. To-day he has called attention to the fact that in his opinion my answer on that question was not quite plain enough and yet he has not answered it himself. He now puts a question in relation to Congressional interference in the territories to me I answer him direct, and yet he has not answered the question himself. I ask you whether a man has any right, in common decency, to put questions in these public discussions, to his opponent, which he will not answer himself, when they are pressed home to him. I have asked him three times, whether he would vote to admit Kansas whenever the people applied with a constitution of their own making and their own adoption, under circumstances that were fair, just and unexceptionable, but I cannot get an answer from him. Nor will he answer the question which he put to me, and which I have just answered in relation to Congressional interference in the territories, by making a slave code there. It is time that he goes on, to answer the question by arguing that under the decision of the Supreme Court it is the duty of a man to vote for a slave code in the territories. He says that it is his duty, under the decision that the court has made, and if he believes in that decision he would be a perjured man if he did not give the vote. I want to know whether he

is not bound to a decision which is contrary to his opinions just as much as to one in accordance with his opinions - (0) the decision of the Supreme Court, the tribunal created by the constitution to decide the question. is final and binding, and he is bound by it just as much as it he is.

"jfeit > 1 "

^ l'!' 2 "2 i 11 :::-f= "1. = ~ i ^ a: " ^ i E ai ^

I - = S " -1 * - r*, r- W ~ > i. - '^^ *^ - o oj -ri - - o

- S "U 3 3 O Ci - !3 O *-; W7 -^ , O

a "- > ^ ^ o 0- " A 5 c s *j 0 (D 3 a j2 s- -3 O C- O 'J C S ' ^ e C _c c j j f j o j 3 a ^ '- r" cr -^ k j " ,1 - 5 S S ? : ' ^ " " c & -t -^ ^ J = ? ^ - 50 . a, a j *- -t: ^ w 5 . S = 5 ^ . 3 % i 4 j - Si's C 00 O J m o " 2

J-S --'ZjW

a c , o ^

j3 a b o 5 >- c b.- -3 J = *- n . = S a . 5 " = ' 3 > -:: "O -a _ o o --^ t: 3 ^ o 03 ,---- . ^ _____ = , = ^ -----*Ti., ^ ^ , , , , , v----- . ^ * s CD -C -3 T: > ^ B a -^ 3 <n f > Tl .3 6r 'x 0 -a J =

a, g Sol- S 3 o a" o . a. S > 3 S <N

B-2 I <U CO X s =

s ^ Q S 5 8 = . / . : zi ' M ' - (U ic N C t- ^ -3 S C ^ G O J 3 - D. 3 O a t: -a . ~ "" ^ ~ ^ -^ 73 T3 ^ - 3 C 0 - 33 m 3 S 1 o B -^ o -S -3 - & 3 I 0)' -3 S - S - ^ -c

0 K! ^ 53 3 g O S ^ S 3 73 , 13 "3 O ^ c 5 > O J ^ ""

^ ^ | ^ r '-sj. -: ? > / - = E " ? E c s r c ^ . " ^ - ' ^ = ' , :: " ' ^ - ' ; ^ S - j -IS B " = ? ^ ^ ' ^ -5 ^ S s > B ^ . ^ ' ^ ~ 0 ^ 3 O J *j C C * c: - c 9- ^ i r ^ " i - i ^ 3 " j - ' j - S ^ M . 2 T3 3 o ; > - ^ ^ , t: - u 3 , _ X3 *- * o . - * . / 3 i " ^ ^ -^ t l s

ir c eS C c

"3-C, ^ | ^ ^ 3 | =

s! ^ e j3 - a. - "2 - i - - c c 0" = ^ = <2 - > = ^ - D. S o QJ 4p

- '/') = CO i 3J <D 3 30 - '^ js t3 m -C o O ?. " u 3 ^ = O > r 1- S a o "7 a s ^ tn , a> 'C OJ

t>?: 5 " ! Ti - - >Jl c ^ ^ n fu "ctD ;S "? ^ g-tl S-^,-S = g-0. "S ^ ^ 5-; ^ ^ 3 U 1.2 ^ l o - - <N to CL. . '!
i-2S-5e^j-s^.-5; 3 >* - 3 " ?i 2 g -s *- ^" ^ . CC "3 = '-_a-n "-s g^os_ ^oa. <a a>--_-3 " o 3 5 c ^ -3 2 -c -= s -
s = ' " " - OJ ffl ^ i i - ^ "5 s " " .5 n f c st-2 " 3 ,. . --, !> 'l ^' S- 2 -/! ' a; i> -c ^ - 6 -- = = ' < ' aj l l ^ .-i P GO ft x
ISO . nt.iua>^7:iao &j3ijci3a3s*c-i;-2-2'i-^ ' Q oj c a.-s - ^ _ - d O ^C2|.S. ^ ^ si og|^ _ 01 " t- aj ^,- O a -i
>^ o - ^ r ^ , ; < x: D T.-' >>> r ^ a- ' ^ ^ ^ O,

.0 3 O

C- (he S g c - ^ aj ^ C * ^ ^ o ^ - ^

O r s!

3 0, 1- 2 ~. 2? l-. d c " S -a _g - ^ x j= -. <, ^ 3 s s g s J ^ .s = '-^: ! ^ s 5 ^ * -3 .oj^r, eg=c = 39 2 2 .; o ?; err .
bo c CQ -a cj u ^ e*- jO O - S 'J = c c -go M 1 > 6C =:) - - x; 5 . S.- -3 ^ = _g .S ^' g.

, _D <S <D 5?, 00 s oa sj S 3 "- 5 o t- Q ^ o ^ cti o n .- r; .ti S > ^ 00 a ' " i2- 3 bt - g c taari ^ _ ^ ^ >- ^ ~' n;
' ' - ^ ,u 'J-' =0 s IS S 2 T3 U fc- ^ .2 " t; -3

: -3 ?= : tb z3 . B S 3 : - C- K -3 rH OJ . _ 3 O -3 _c * * - -rt * ^ J '5C ~ - > .- w - "r ^ " ^ 3 3 Cj S * tl> "5
_5=j25v_2?i^cog""?3o2" 3

- .- a; CB _ 2 >*-- ni-3o- err " i "J u <r - - i i ^ 3'n_ >- >2t3

- ^ - ^ ^ - ^ ^ o ^ - *r n ^ ai * - >- 3 -3 _ " .5 - S "S U - 3 E ^ , b ^ i 3 3 ~ 4 3 -; = p t i z> " 3 *' =i

3 "t^ g M 3 H O 03 ^ aj 03 3 3 " = 03 O 3 x: 3 03 3 " " C! 3 ^ -= ^ =*. .2 ^ 3 -H g * - S ^ 2; -3 ^ . ^ f

03 (D ^ - ^ J3 o _XJ -o S E . ^ " " 3 S ^ s - ^ r; at . ijC 3 m J-. C S <" e ^ 03 tj ^ i 03 3 a 5 at "3 3 1 5.2 c! U ^
"3 ^Er-3: ^ 3 -^c: -333 03 ;: ^ P S " !? lI _S oX - S =; "- t ^ *. '2 -o c o 03 ^ora*j 3 .C-/ . ^ *- ' , "" c::n.ni'--->ooa/-
<D i- , ' 5 _ w - - ^ ' ^ ^ X > o 03 = - .t; c i c t> ^ 3-3-r-cs-^ -3u oM -a>*!-" .irs-lHt". ss'r'3.-3-^: ?35 "" ^ 03_bc

oCi,3o;3 ^acc-r>Mc: - - "-" ~ . Sli g,5H^ ^^= 3^S gS-3.^ ' S3 , - - i! 3 3 C3 r* 2 "" -" ^ c -^ Oj 03 -r3 - -^ ^
w- _i tta, ^ ^ . ^ ? *"i - > . 3 E o S -=? - l, 2 -5 ^ -3 = .2 S 0 . |j ^ 2 5 - ^ l ? - l S * ^ .^ 3 ^ 2 " S ii ? C-' '

'^ 5 s , , n . ~^ t* -^ ~3 r 03 -j J (-i, ^ ^ ^ 03 - a . -a C 33 .2 -2 3 - 3 ' 3^ l j . . ; , uQ o a . :3 ? S ' ^ !5 -1 . a

5 S E o -C ; ^ 3 ^ .3S3 ;;;r-'x ^ 5 2 '5 '3 3 S 6=- fa ^ >< ?< O , _ a . ^^ ' O 03 ' _3 03 S 03 ? e l ^ .00
0.00-55,0034^0 03 03.^"==22t3^2^ " ? 03 S 2 03 O 3 l g ^2i0Mc8_2" . :Co3x^T3i:t3r3>-' "--^ C3c-._5-u^
^^a,p^ c -3

S o g >.^ = o Hl " -c - ^ K < S O 03o;r;rjqi^_M) _ ^ ,.^ ^-^ l-S 2 a , 3 l O 3 _ 03 -jj fc- _ fc- C3 .3.:" "<,3 T S '5^
S t- K ^ ^ - , 's-3c,g-^S'^^2^'" oo3'r-ni>ia3J^c :>,_:r^5 :^' 03 - " -'" ^i^O-n C 3 i3 ?j O 03 , -^ ?-r.i: -5 ' :z "2
S 3^3'S|f5|g^,, C be O bcj= O S oj c* = T3 .s -^ s c _g>-5 S -5 l 3 - l l ,a03Bo"03O-3^ -S" 3^ ^ .3.? 03 33-3
jO-"SJ 03 fc- -3 O " QJ 0) bCjD 3- 3 ,2 -3 > -^ c - "Jr. ' ^a^'B -- oj--o .s;a,c-T^'^a303^5.5j: ^c33 t:aai^J-Hj=c
Q.-3 S -3 - a> 3 S t: , , ^ g r- 3 Ol -r-^ 3 . -j 1 ^

"^^mw- iipiMi '^^

-^ 3 o 2 -= -a !D !1> i ^ 5 r- -^ -Z- ^ ro > - 5 . , ^ e "" a _____Bl j tj ^ 3 'i; _ ^ :c - ceo | -g C O -! O i:
-a " a . c St. 0) 1- c - O .- t_ - 3! o g t = :^ * ^ - &..E -g -g " " 3 a 5 -Si (jj c ~ 5 Cq

- -c e =" 2 2 cj S ^ i" -c o c - 'd ^ i a s -a t; 3 J' CJ O) ^* wx> i^ - S ?3 o^- K QJ ,1-* O fc- 3 i.:S 2 " ^ bo > ^ r'
3 . g , a> ^ * ^ 1* P Nj e _3J *- . ** G c 5 1 J 2 .2 Q ^ X CJ " ?

X < tir.

'-^5 3 C

o o a i ^ = :2 " i fl s - ^;; -g n l j> _^:3_ =^ s ? : 2 " " ^ ^ " o . S > ^2 o rr: g 3 'j _a . , oj - t^ ;; P c> S S X! o -a <;
" , -3 o a , _t: ~ o 3 3 -^ Oj C , " 2 -s 5 5 ; ^ ^ ? :i > ^ c a;d c i S t^ l l 3j 3 3 e- J3 -J -C S - S 2 = 5 " ~ 'Hi 3 . .
-3 ::i a . t \ 0) ft c - *^ o

3

CD TO c- ft O o ^ -t3 c

a "j

CJ :6 . ^ t; O TJ o -C ^ 'i) "H d a* S

-^' <fefe; . V-^ ^ AT OHAKLIESTON. Mr. iincolu's Speech. Mr. Lincoln took the stand at a quarter before three, and was greeted with yjscifer- ous and protracted applause ; after wlnoli^h*^ said: L^DiEa AND Gentlemen : It will T>e V6ry difBcalt for an audience so large as this to hear distinctly what a speaker sayg^ and con- sequently it is important that as prefojMid silence he preserved as possibles ".Afhile I was at t&e hotel to day an elderly gentlemati called upon me to ltnow whether! was really in favor of producing a perfect equality between the negroes and white people. Oi^atianghiet.^ While I had not pro- posed to mysell' on thi-s occasion to Say much on that subject, yet as the questiwa Was asked me I thought I would OCCilpy perhaps five minutes in sayiilg something in regard to it. 1 will say then that I am not, nor ever have been in tavor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races, appiaiaacj that t. am not nor ever have been in favor vif tUakiug voters or jurors of negroesy tio'r of qualifying them to hold ofiice, aor to intermarry with white people ; and I will say in addition to this that there is a plysical difference between the white and black races which I beliere will for ever forbid the two races living together ou terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the posi- tion of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other mau am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race. I say upon this occasion 1 do not perceive^; that because the white man is to have the superior position the negro should be denied everything. 1 do not understand that because ldo not want a negro woman for a slave I mvist necessarily want her for a wife. Chcei:a aad.iaughier. My understanding is that I can just let her alone. I am now in my fiftieth year, and I certainly never have had a black woniail for either a slave or a wife. So it seems to me quite possible for us to get along without making either slaves or wives of negroes. I will add to this that I have never seen to my knowledge a man, woman or child who was in favor of producing a perfect equality, social and po- litical, between negroes and white men. I recollect of but one distinguished instance that I ever heard of so frequently as to be en- tirely satiscfid of its correctness and that is the case of Judge Douglas' old friend Col. Pachard &, Johnson. .pEralt^^^*eK\$ I will also add to the remarks X have made, (for I am not going to enter at large upon this sub- ject.) that I have never had the least appre- hension that I 'r my friends would marry ne- groes if (here was no law to keep them from it, iagbter but as Judge Douglas and his friends seem to be in great apirrehension that tley might, if there were no law to keep them from it,'roMS-(iLiaugh%er I give him the iriost solemn pledge that I will to the very last standby tlie law of this Siate, which for- ^'Sblds the marrying of while people with ne- grocP GotCtttiuAl*iiter.- B<i.a{>pJaijga, I will add one further word, whic i is thi;;, that I do not understand there is any place where an alteration of the social and political r(lations of the negro and the white man can be made esfcept in the State Legislature n-'t in the Congress of theUnited Scates- and as I do not really apprehend t.-e approach of aiiy such thing myself, and as Judge Bouglas sijems to be in constant

horror that some such danger is rapidly approaching, I propose as the best means to prevent it that the Judge be kept at home and placed in the State Legislature to fight the measure. Eepr-earioas laughtes 'snd applasss^ I do not propose 'd-velling longer at this time on this subject. When Judge Trumbull, our other Senator in Congress, returned to Illinois in the month of August, he made a speech at Chicago in which he made what may be called a challenge against Judge Douglas, which I understand proved to be very offensive to him. The Judge was at that time out upon one of his speaking tours through the country, and when the news of it reached him, as I am informed, he denounced Judge Trumbull in rather harsh terms for having said what he did in regard to that matter. I was traveling at that time and speaking at the same places with Judge Douglas on subsequent days, and when I heard of what Judge Trumbull had said of Douglas and what Douglas had said back again, I felt that I was in a position where I could not remain entirely silent in regard to the matter. Consequently upon two or three occasions I alluded to it, and alluded to it in no other wise than to say that in regard to the charges brought by Trumbull against Douglas, I personally knew nothing and sought to say nothing about it that I did personally know Judge Trumbull that I believed him to be a man of veracity that I believed him to be a man of capacity sufficient. I made a set of facts, was true or false; and as a conclusion of my own from that, I stated it as my belief, if Trumbull should ever be called upon he would prove everything he had said. I said this upon two or three occasions. Upon a subsequent occasion, Judge Trumbull spoke again before an audience at Alton, and upon that occasion not only repeated his charge against Douglas, but arrayed the evidence he relied upon to substantiate it. This speech was published at length; and subsequently at Jacksonville Judge Douglas alluded to the matter. In the course of his speech, and near the close of it, he stated in regard to myself what I will now read: "Judge Douglas proceeded to remark that he should not hereafter occupy his time in refuting the charges made by Trumbull, but that Lincoln having indorsed the character of Trumbull for veracity, he should hold him (Lincoln) responsible for the slanders." I have done simply what I have told you, to subject me to this invitation to notice the charge. I now wish to say that it had not originally been my purpose to discuss that matter at all. But inasmuch as it seems to be the wish of Judge Douglas to hold me responsible for it, then for once in my life I will play General Jackson and to the just extent I take the responsibility. I wish to say at the beginning that I will hand to the reporters that portion of Judge Trumbull's Alton speech which was devoted to this matter, and also that portion of Judge Douglas' speech made at Jacksonville in answer to it. I shall thereby furnish the readers of this debate with the complete discussion between Trumbull and Douglas. I cannot now read them, but I would take half of my first hour to do so. I can only make some comments upon them. Trumbull's charge is in the following words: "Now, the charge is, that there was a plot entered into to have a constitution formed for Kansas and put in force without giving the people an opportunity to vote upon it," and that Mr. Douglas was in the plot." I will state, without quoting, further, for all will have an opportunity

of' reading it here- after, that Judge Trumbull brings forward what he regards as sufficient evidence to substantiate this charge. The extracts handed to our reporter by Mr. Lincoln are as follows: "I have the honor to appear in the 10th number of the Press and Tribune, Judge Trumbull's speech at Alton has already had, a-ptaw 4a. Our columns, and Senator Boula's speech at Jacksonville are faithfully repeated in the 11th number of this (Charleston) debate, It will be perceived Judge Trumbull shows that. Senator Bigler, upon the floor of the Senate, had declared there had been a conference among the Senators, in which conference it was determined to have an Enabling Act passed for the people of Kansas to form a Constitution under, and in this conference it was agreed among them that it was best not to have a provision for submitting the Constitution to a vote of the people after it should be formed. He then brings forward to show, and showing, as he deemed, that Judge Douglas has reported the bill back to the Senate with that clause stricken out. He then shows that there was a new clause inserted into the bill, which would in its nature prevent a reference of the Constitution back to the people if, indeed, upon a mere silence in the law, it could be assumed that they had the right to vote upon it. These are the general statements that he has made. I propose to examine the points in Judge Douglas' speech, in which he attempts to answer that speech of Judge Trumbull's. When you come to examine Judge Douglas' speech, you will find that the first point he makes is "Suppose it were true that there "was such a change in the bill, and that I "struck it out is that a proof of a plot to "force a Constitution upon them against their "will?" His striking out such a provision, if there was such a one in the bill, he argues does not establish the proof that it was stricken out for the purpose of robbing the people of that right. I would say, in the first place, that that would be a most manifest reason for it. It is true, as Judge Douglas states, that many Territorial bills have passed without having such a provision in them. I believe it is true, though I am not certain, that in some instances. Constitutions framed, under such bills have been submitted to a vote of the people, with the law silent upon the subject, but it does not appear that they once had their Enabling Acts framed with an express provision for submitting the Constitution to a vote of the people, and then that they were stricken out which Congress did not mean to alter the effect of the law. That there have been bills which never had the provision in, I do not question; but when was that provision taken out of one that it was in? More especially does this evidence tend to prove the proposition that I have advanced) When we remember that the provision was stricken out of the bill almost simultaneously with the time that Bigler says there was a conference among certain Senators, and in which it was agreed that an Enabling Act should be passed leaving that out. Judge Douglas, in answering Trumbull, omits to attend to the testimony of Bigler, that there was a meeting in which it was agreed to strike out the provision."

"I am up to the false claim. (Hiram A. Tilden.) I ask you what you think of Trumbull thus juggling around the country lying and falsifying the public records. I ask you whether you will install a man who will descend to the baseness of such conduct. (Charles A. Tilden, ex-fide- Mr. Douglas proceeded to

reark that he should not hereat occupy his time in refuting such charges by Trumfeld,
but Lincoln having endorsed

the character of Truitt's veracity, he should hold him (Lincoln) responsible for the alterations. And
Judge when his appointment was concluded, was finally to the Hotel by the vast procession.
The guarantee of their resolutions in his presence, and the beautiful harmony
during the evening. Later on the night a ball was given with liomy, and at an early hour this
morning the story of the wound up by a serenade. --B. < B7 : M B? o 1 = a B- > S: E M^ 2 ^ - n < ^ n *
3 S

P-3i3>, (i-a-Sa M='t:'S4j a SJ o ? = o t. s.^ g B ^a 3 a*^ "-, o acti g ^t 2 a) - o.s o -? a l'''-s f .2 ^^ asa > .2
fc.^ s : | r{ikiii | i 1^ r Bj -" = l -a-T a C ^ "*" " ^ ^ rt'-'n: ^" ^-aw o 2.a a *- iS 4^ Xi o CO a Ji M U.J2 P u H p>,
a o o d " <0 rt ij -=1 a

"t; a fl

th o 1 o M s o ,5S t^Tj

- 2 t o a *.^ g ' a JO'S o* - o a ^o " a O to ; a) oj^ a a p:'3 o

fell 55>SS2-oS-t-g2'a. -= J 2 " ^ J-s"? a a o o js j .. a g 2 !=a<o 'i 3 ;; 0"2 o O Q O Oi g a > > te "*" a.^ s-5 ^
a^ 4* -y te o^_~ o c^ xgs a- g 5; S aS-^." -a s^ g gj hS2 .. > a^ a

a a " " :: a s: It a S'3 flog^S^^a S a ,. o 5.S jz g oS a - g a 3 g /, -o .s g ~ S ly ^ 4> ?^ ^ja a ^ trf n (o Sgl-
^D'SslSjlOoa o.,^a>, _., _.. jO 6S a^ *- SS"5 a a -** (^ ^ ** ^ rt ^ _ _ - 9 | Ot3 p (o 3 !u =" see 3 p ' 0,4
3-2 a fc, s- o a rf ' a -;

^H^a^al: 4) A ja .i X) ^ ^ ^ ^ o ^+J o- C3-X3 ai oj g~3o a ? :

^a o ; a aj . ^ a - ; i" a ?^ ^ = a <^ u ^ - 35 .ja Jit oj > B'- a~ o o o ^-!-2* | ^f:.S525 | 35a li^a i 3*0 tl-a fc-S.o
a "- "

51' o l-C a>afot^o ^HQOa_ ^a>- !^ -5 i- S o 3 2 S S TaS"" ;^t: " a 3^xj "f^ g . . aj +2^ " ? ~ - ^ Si 3* a a S; a-
aj-^Ssiv. o _ . ^ a a a) a-o a.'- a g^a o r3 Soa3 =

a>oS<M 3-a52-2 asl-aSiS-^^a *ij* --aMjMaTaE; 1 aj-a^, ^ oa." 2 - ., o a, 3 5 2 : 3 ^" J o a> r "4^ " a g j-
a e^." u m^ s._y2, eg a S -^a S S S >>a oa-;5Si_5 j.aSs - a -"i^ " o , " -a~ 6ga gja -- a a 5 tj a a." a^a o a .,
a^agigS^V; | t l -oO-^5'gA -ga^o5Sa -t; -^= g "f^^j-^sl a^ a" S l

-,.-s.-.--"2.SSg^ Sa o'-^a a-2 *""3 a-al-.i2 o f, "^^ 1^ g|-3-2 a ! ^-Sr-^SS" = 8 a "" a g^ l d fe a a"i 3 a lie
=lS,g.2-^s ? s? =-25 s g "-5 - gA, a; a ga a4 ao a 3 S ^^ a^ 3 o : S .52 ' a a. a"S P, a! a-""a>^ 2 a * "2 " "
g .bijai-^as25gQ c s, a- ~ lf-a a .'s w % 3 3 " s 3 aiS2ai"3|-S M .Ha-32 3 f- 1'32 2 s S-s'S-s-S a-S b? K -a g
_. ^ - ij rt it ^ cj .. ** *3 r. G -i oj a o o >^ g .-^

o a ' a 5 g a-a : *- .2 -^ - ^ iSj' . a. " ..a?2i- a -^i:: *i a 'o a " " iaS| 5 ".S o .i &o3oSs"i2 .a-2P'fe^^ i:5 ^3 ' a 0
ai 3 - - i i^aT30qsijo -a 0) o :: " P a-^ e a flS-S" a^fa~ a" .3 S* ."ajS^ *.i a *2-. a " ' 6o. j2s2-^*""

S C-S- xj a w , !X 00'^ -a o l a?it?-a c5 = "53 aaj .a t>. a) a| ^ CO +j sj - a , t:-~' Bj *- * fl "3 " ^ " a) ,. j -^ - ^
2 5 o ** tp-*^ 0.0,3 ; S^

3 Z3^ ^ L."S:Sg 3.2 g 5 .a . 3 o) a o 1^ a S ^ - g a <i .-^ 3 ja -a .^ a a ^ 5 l Ss a a.^,g a S g.. - l s 3 g a.a
^ ^3S.2 3i5 | .as:-r2ia os-^^-^l Ig.Svg'-raii'Sag-S.a-SoaSg o/: S S = - a g S^i.^S < a_ s: a o Si2ai-32S
=:Sjt;3oo.a .sg.SS | ai a5SSg. 'a^a-^.:a3g=-^ -^ g.'SS. ^^^^ t::=^*;; oTn * -.>, O -w

SgS a ? O V> C at! OO.Jj T3 (u +^ ^ o ^a ^ *" - -^-=a jog-^ 3 -2 = 3 S- 3a- lf"" .as 'ji t, a> o ^ a ^ -" *
>* .5>.a'o | gS2i | sg2 rg j L- T3 aw 3 a **2 " -c- Sill ?^ -"-* ^S!a3-g.gt .2 4j ^ " ^ " ,t. J aaisO -S3.^P _" o - r
a .H ^ll's^ig" V^ Ol ' c::; ' b(i - , O ; ^t: :! ar

. tiMMMHiiT --*-i | 8p^>. g | fci.%taHitW* -MM should so frame thi bi'l tijot there should be np
snbhiesioa of .he Constitution to a vote of the pe .pie. T'le Judge does not notice this part e.f it. l; you
take this as one piece of evidence, and then ascertain that eimUltra- neously Judge Doughs struck
out a provis- More thau this, is it true that what Trum- buU did can have any eft'ect on what Doug-
las did? AnnlaUML. Suppose TrumbuU had been in the plot with these other men, would that let
Douglas out of it? '*y- T.I-IMH, jiiWfT^^Mjttaci Would it exonerate neously Judge Doughs struck out
a provis- j);,u .ias that Trumbull didn't then D'Toeive ion that did require it to.bfe Kilb.-nittedj aud
|,g ^".^g in the plot? He also asks the ques- ^: put the two together, t think It will make a ^^^^ . -
^hy didn't TrumbuU propose to araecd * pretty fair Baow of proof that Judge Uouglas ^^^ i^iu jf
j^g thought it needed any ameu- ! (lin n.a Trnmbllll SaVS. enter into a plot to __, ii; i_ TViolloTTO
t.lmt. OTTorIT^HiiTin-Tn/lffo ^ 1-. ., - ^ - ^ - . - , " tne uiil li uc 111 ;t.i^ii-j i.- uv.^ui.-vi tLLiy amend'
dia, as Trumbull says, enter ,into a plot to ^^^^, Why, I believe that every thing Judge put in force a
CoustitutioB tor Kansas with- ^^,^^^^^1 j^ad proposed, particularly In cou- out giving the people
any pportiinity ol ^^^(4;^,^ ^jti, this question of Kansas and Ne- votincr upon it. ^,raska, since he

had been on the floor of the ^ But '1 must terry Oft. The next proposition gg^ate. had been promptly voted down by that .Tiidge Douglas puts is this : But upoi j^^ Douglas and his friends. He had no examination it turns out that the^ ioombs -^y^jge fijat an amendment offered by him bill sever did contain a clause requirmg ^ the ^^ anything on this subject would receive the Constitution to be submitted. This js a j, | - j^jgg consideration. Judge Trumbull did mere question of fact, and Cau be determined 1 ^^ .j^^^ ^^ jj^g ^gygg of i ,^ Senate at that time by evidence, t only want to ask this ques- i, . ^ (-j.i^ f (i,^,.,^! mtmo im T^7.mTicwin tion Why did not Judge Douglas say 1'^^' - the fact that there was no provision for sub- tnat _;ij.-----+V.rt r^(^Tit'f-i tnfir.ii nlianf +r\ Via TYi'illii f.'.i' these words were not stricken out_ oj the Toombs bill, or this bill from which it is o,L leadethe provision was stricken out a biU which i^oesby the name of Toombs, because he originally broughtit forward? I ask why, iftheJud<>-e wanted to make a direct issue with Trumbull. did he not take the exact proposition Trumbull made in his speech, and gay it was not stricken out ? Trumbull has given the exact words that he says were in the Toombs bill, and he alleges that when the bill came back, they were stricken out. Judge Douglas does iLOt say that the words which Trumbull says We*e Btricken out, were not so stricken oil, but he says there was no provi- sion in the Toombs bill to submit the Consti- tution to a vote of the people. We see at once that he is merely making an issue upon the meaning of the words. He has not un- dertaken to say that Trumbull tells a lie about these words being stricken out; but he is really, when pushed up to it, only taKing an issue upon the meaning of the words. Now then, if there be any issue upon the meaning of the words, or if there be upon the mitting the Constitution about to be made for the people of Kansas, to a vote of the people. I believe I may venture to say that Judge Douglas made some reply to this speech of Judge TrumbulVi:', but he never noticed that part of it at all. And so the thing pas&ed by. I think, then, the fact that Judge Trumbull offered no amendment, does not throw much blame upon him ; and if it did, it does not reach the , question of fact 5 to what Judge Douglas wan doing. _h^Aaimm I repeat that if Trumbull had himself been in the plot, it would not at all relieve the others who were in it from blame. It I should he indict- ed for murder, and upon the trial it should be discovered that I had been implicated in that murder, but that the prosecuting witness was guilty too, that would not at all touch the question of my crime. It would be no re- lief to my neck that they discovered this other man who charged the crime upon me to be guilty too. Another one of the points Judge Douglas makf a upon Judge TrutubuU is, that when he spoke in Chicago he made his charge to rest upon the fact that the bill had the provision in it for submitting the Constitution to a vote questioS of fact as to whether these words ^,^ ^^ ^^ __ ^-----....._.....----- were stricken out, I have before me what i ^f tjig people, when it went into his (Judge suppose to be a genuine copy of the Toombs 1 Douglas') haiid^, that it was missing when he "I ill in which it can be shown that-the words rgported it to the Senate, and that in a public Trumbull says were in it, were, in fact, origi- gpgeeh he had subsequently f aid the alteration nally there. If there be any dispute Upofl the j^ ^jg \,\\\ ^as raaHe while it was in commit- fact I have got the documents here to show jgg^ and that they were male in

consultation they were there. If there be any controversy logtweeu him (Judge Douglas) and Toombs. upon the sense of the words whether these ^n^ Judge Douglas goes on to comment words which were stricken out really consti- ^pg^ the fact of Trumbull's adducing in his tuted a provision for submitting the matter ^^01 " "-,-,i---i j. n proitii-ju. -." -----o to a vote of the people, as that is a matter ot argument, I think I may as well use Trum- bull's own argument. He says that the pro- position is in these words : That fhe foUowins pronoslitions be and the same are vpTebv offered to the said convention of the ueople -f t- when foimed, for their free a-oeptanoe or rip.c- K.an6as uo .(. epted hy *e conrention atut, ratwed f^ijimple^iVie elMtiMpor the adopt cm oj-the (l^amtim, shall be oblisatoVPon the Unittd Mates w ^ TrnmbuU alleges that these last words *"" ;"" ""?r"-----7. " 'ht i *" - ^" JrickSi out of the bill when it came ^t'l* i,""" tie q'l'f tion. Now m regard to rwere strickCn oun ui ,.n-7;=;, r what he says, that Trumbull back, aud he says thi was a pioysion for _that he shifts his firound-,a Alton speech the-proposition that the bill not only came back with that proposition stricken out, but with another clause and another pro- vision in it, saying that "until tlie com- "plete execution of this act .there shall be no "election in said Territory," which Trum- bull argued was not only taking the provis- ion for submitting to a vote of the people out of the bill, but was adding an affirmative one, in. that it prevented the people from exercis- ing the right under a bill that was merely -----^, shifts the issue ^that he shifts his ground .and I believe he uses the term,that "it being proven.false, he has changed ground"-^! call risbu all of you, when you come to examine that portion of Trumbull's speech, (for it will make a part of mine,) to examine whether Trumbull haa shifted hiS'ground or not. I say he did not shift his ground, but that he brought forward his original charge and the evidence to sus- tain it yet more fully, but precisely as he originally made It, Then, in addition there- to, be brought in a new piece of CYldeneo. si^bmitting the Constitution to a vote of the nrople i his argument is this : ; Would it 'have been possible to ratity the land propo- " sitions at the election for the adoption of " the Gonstiiution, unless such an election "was to be held?" HWJliU^lt.....h^f^ That is Trumbull's argument. Now Judge Douglas does not meet the charge at all, but he stands up and says there was no such pro- oosUiou in that bill for submitting the Con- stitution to be framed to a vote of the peo- ple Trumbull admits that the bnguage is not a direct provision for submitting it, but ,~7 ..j^ ^^ ound. -----=^, it is a provision necessarily implied from an- 1 He slut'ed, no g j^^g^t withbis former other provision. He asks you how it is pos- P'ef.l,"^^",^,, he brought a new piece, tend- sible to ratify the land proposition at the let ^y'tiouKht and as I think, to prove 'election for the adopt-iou of the Const tuti,;.m, "f^f^,^; ^j^^To Ulustrate : A man br n^s if there was no election to be held or the l^proPX^ against another, and on tml ,. . r the Constitution. And he goes ^C^ftm^ the charge ^tj-f^uces ^ He brought no new ado"ption"of' the Constitution. And he goes on to show that it is not any less a law be- caue"the provision is put in that indirect shape thau it would be if it was put directly. But I presume I have said enough to draw attention to this point, and I pass it by also. Another one of the points that Judge Doug- las makes upon Trumbull, and at very great length, is, tbat TrhmbuU, while the bill was nending, said in a speech m the Senate

that he supposed the Constitution to be mt.de would have to be sutimittod to the people. He asks if Trumbull thought so then, what irround is there for anybody thinking other- wise now ? Fellow citizens, this much may be said in reply : That bill had been in the hands of a party to which Trumbull did not belono- It ljad been in the hands of the Committee at the head of which Judge Doug- las stood. Trumbull perhaps had a printed e^py of the original Toombs bill. I have not the'evidence on that point, except a sort of inference I draw from the general course of business there. What alterations, or what nrovisions in the way of altering, wore going on in committee, Trumbull had no means of knowing, until the altered bill was reported back Soon afterwards, when it was reported back' there was a discussion over it, and per- haps' TrdmbuU in reading it hastily in the altered form did not perceive all the bearings of the alterations. He was hast.i 1 y borne into the debate, and it docs not follow that be- ca.use there was something in it Trumbull did ', ____;,.^ <i. , -nipethina- did not cvist aM Tto prove the apcusation.. At a sef^nA Sal hi inirodtices the safie w"nesses who tellVae same story as before, and a a,r,d wit- 1 nes who tells the same thin^ _ ^ addi- tion; gives f- r^er testimony oorroborative Of the charge. So with Truw-bull, Tnere wa*no mWt grottliid, nor inconsistency SteaShiony, between ^^^^^X^Z^I moved to strtke out that last Provision of the 5'^^tSi^~ SIHiE :Tt:rof1S as jSg:Xuglas reported <'t back It was amended somewhat in the " tnate before it passed, but I am speasmg " ^fifas he brought It back.'* No* when Tud.eou"las parades the faOt that the pro- XtSb^ n Sel" T.nr | bunjias^ not ?n the WI wbn it went tti m comniittee. When It came back it wasin.andJndge Doug- f; 1 the alterations were made by him m !::j:iSui'.* nitSTToomSS^umbuU alleges I

u -X i/' onclusiou that Judge Doug- ec__jf Dougla^vauts to con- tfiidict 'i'rumhiill aaci CalTmSa liar, let hiui say he did uotput it in, and not that ije didn't take it out again. It is said that a bear is sometimes hard enough pushed to drop a cub, and so 1 presume it was in this case. Liwi jijjliaaa*. I presume the truth is that Doug- las put it in and afterwards took it out. truth about it. Judge TrumbuU says one thing ; Douglas says another thing, and the two don't contradict one another at all. The question is, what did he put it in for! In the first place what did he take the other provision out of the bill for? the provision which TrumbuU argued was neecessary for submit- tia the Constitutioti to a vote of the people? What did he take that out for, and having taken it out, what did he put this in for? I say thit in the run of things it is not unlikely forces conspire, to render it vastly expedient for Judge Douglas to take that latter clause out again. The question that TrumbuU has made is that Judge Douglas put it in, and he don't meet TrumbuU at all unless he denies that. ylu the clause of Judge Douglas' speech "upon this subject he uses this language to- wards Judge TrumbuUi He says : " He for- "" ges his evidence from beginning to end, " and by falsifying the record he endeavors ' to bolster up his false charge." Well, that is a pretty serious statement. TrumbuU forges his evidence from beginning to end. Now upon my own authority I say that it is is a iorgery ? Consider the evidence that TrumbuU

has brought forward. When you come to read the speech, as you will be able to. examine whether the evidence is a forgery from beginning to end. He had the bill or document in his hand like that holding up a paper. He says that is a copy of the Toombs bill the amendment offered by Toombs. He says that is a copy of the bill as it was introduced and went into Judge Douglas' hands. Now, does Judge Douglas say that is a forgery? That is one thing Trumbull brought forward. Judge Douglas says he forged it from beginning to end! That is the "beginning," we will say. Does Douglas say that is a forgery? Let him say it to-day and we will have a subsequent examination upon this subject.

Trumbull then holds up another document like this and says that is an exact copy of the bill as it came back in the amended form out of Judge Douglas' hands. Does Judge Douglas say that is a forgery? Does he say it in his general sweeping charge? Does he say so now? If he does not, then take this Toombs bill and the bill in the amended form and it only needs to compare them to see that the provision is in the one and not in the other; it leaves the inference inevitable that it was taken out.

Trumbull then deals with this question let us see what Trumbull's other evidence is. One other piece of evidence I will read. Trumbull says there are in this original Toombs bill these words: "That the people of Kansas, when formed, for their free acceptance or rejection; which, if accepted by the convention and ratified by the people at the election for the adoption of the constitution, shall be obligatory upon the United States and the said State of Kansas." Now, if it is said that this is a forgery, we will open the paper here and see whether it is or not. Again, Trumbull says as he goes along, that Mr. Bigler made the following statement in his place in the Senate, December 1st, when that subject was discussed by him. "The bill was introduced, and the question sent to the Senate, when the Senate voted to a vote of yeas and nays. It was voted, that Mr. Trumbull, on the subject, that Mr. Trumbull's surrogates that Territory, the 25th of November. Mr. Trumbull at that time of a popular vote, that there was no such provision in the Toombs bill; and it was my understanding, in all the time Toombs was in the Convention, that he would make an announcement without submitting it to the popular vote." Then Trumbull follows on: "In speaking of this meeting again on the 21st December, 1857 (Congressional Globe, same vol., page 113,) Senator Bigler said: 'It was further from my mind than to allude to it in my interview. The meeting was of a private character. Indeed, it was semi-official and not of the public good. My recollection was that at the conference under the impression that Mr. Bigler best to adopt measures to admit Kansas it had been through the action of one popular election, that I felt for delegates to this Convention. This impression and that for the benefit of the spirit of the bill was a serious non-intervention, to which I laid a serious objection with the hope of accomplishing the desired result. No movement had been made in a general assembly. I waived this objection, and I did to support the measure. I have a few and concluded to support the measure of these important items of Mr. Trumbull's submission I shall be content I shall before me the bill reported by the Senator from Illinois before me to provide for the admission

'o7KansSalaaS the third section of which reads as fowl's, ' . it,y,e follow'ng propositions be. and the same are "thatthelouownnP 1 p gn,i,,n (f ,i,e people of liereby offered to 'fja' ^^^^ acceptance or re.ec- Kansas. ^viiientminf'" ^"l^ Convention and ratiaed tion; which lf aocepwQoj adoption of the ton- ^,5tu'tion!7hV"hfbob?i|at?ynpon tnc United States and "'^S'm\vaiS^ihTp\ace by the S?nator from Georgia, T^^.Ail of nne and referred to Committee on Tern- on the -='i\?J,,ffi,i;eTame sectio . word for word. Both t?'-'=-v?,??Se\ndli-consideration at thee nference re- thes bills we.e nnu^ ^ geaator from Illinois report- terredto; but, . ir. wneni o amendmeDts, the ed toe Toombs bin to tM Be ^,^^^ ^^^.^^^ ^, """; If,Sh indicated to the-uonvention tliat the Con- ioction wliich indicaten ro " „eoDif. The word; Now iue.-.c things TiUiubull .^ays were stated by Bigler upou the floor of the Senate on certain days, and that they, are recorded in the "Uongressional Globe" on certain pag^s. Does Judge Douglas say this is a for'geiy ? Does he say there is no such thing in the"Congressional Globe?" What does he mean when he says Judge TrumbuU forges his evidence from boginuiag to end? So again he says in another place, that Judge D^juglas, in his speech Dec. 9, 1S57, C'Con- gress'onol Globe," part 1, page 15) stated: "That during the last session of Congress I Mr. Doug- las! reported abill frm the Oommittee on Territories, to ^utQori/,^ the people ot Kansas to assemble and form a Constitution for them8t:lves. t^u^sequently the Senator from Georgia Mr. T-ombs brought forward a substitute for my bi'l which, after hamnu been 'ffiodifed by him and myself in consultation, was passa by ihe Senate." Now TrumbuU says this is a quotation from a speech ol Douglas, and is recorded in the "Congressional Globe." Is it a forgery ? Is itthore ornot? It may.not bs there,,but I want the Judge to tajce these pieces of evi- dence, and distinctly say they are forgeries if he dare do it. Bfiwras^g^lBa*. A Voice-^le will/' Mb. Lincoln Well, sir, you had better not commit him. gliiMiin riml.hHjhtai-. He

gives other quotations another from Judge Douglas. He says: " I will ask the Senator to show me an intimation, from any />ne member of the iBenate, in the whole debate on the Toombs bill, and in the Hmoo, from any nuarter, that the C msiituf.on was not to be Fubuutted to the people, t W'li venture to ray that on all sides of the chamber it was so understood at the time. If the opponents of the bill had understood it was not, they would have made the politooit; andif tliey hadmafleit, we shoild certainly havevielledto it: and put in ihe clause. Thatif a dis- covery mad? since the Presidt? nt found out tliat it w^s not Sttfetotalieitforgranied that tliat would be done, which ought in fairness to have been done," Judge TrumbuU says Douglas made that speech and it is recorded. Does Judge Doug- las say it is a forgery and was not true ? TrumbuU says somewhere, and I propose to skip it, but it will be found by any one who will read this debate, that he did distinctly bring it to the notice of those who were en- gineering the bill, that it lacked that provi- sion, and then he goes on to give another quotation from Judge Douglas, where Judge TrumbuU uses this language : Judge Douglas howeve-, on the same day and In the same debate, probably rec.illecting or being reminded of The fact that I had . biected to the Toombs bill when pending that it did. not provide for a Eubmission of the Constitution to the people, made another statemert,which is to be foundin the same volume

of the Globe, page 22, in which he says: "That the bill was filed on this subject was true, and "my attention was called to that about the time it was "pissed; and I took the fair construction to be, that "rows not delegated were reserved, and that of course "the Constitution would be submitted to the people." Whether this statement is consistent with the statement just before made, that had the point been made it would have been yielded to, or that it was a new discovery, you will determine. So I say. I do not know whether Judge Douglas will dispute this, and yet maintain his position that Trumbull's evidence "as^, forged from beginning to end," I will remark that I have not got these Congressional Globes with me. They are large books and difficult to carry about, and if Judge Douglas section "t'", "J'^7Vr; nro'vediry "the'peo'Dif-' The words stitution sbo I'd be appovexi jy i ,^,^^^ ^,^^^^,^ j^^ ;^OR THE" r,?WN"" ^i^ 00MT1TUTL.; V h.d shaU say that on these points where Trumbull has quoted from them, there are no such passages there, I shaU not be able to prove -they are there upon this occasion, but I will have another chance. Whenever he points out the forgery and says, "I declare, this particular thing which Trumbull hits uttered is not to be found here he says it is," then my attention will be drawn to that, and I will answer myself for the contest stating now that I have not the slightest doubt on earth that I will find every quotation just where Trumbull says it is. In the question; s; how can Douglas say that forgery? How can he make it that it is a forgery? What is a forgery? It is the bringing forward something in writing, or in print, purporting to be of certain effect when it is altogether untrue. If you come forward with my note for one hundred dollars when I have never given such a note, there is a forger. It is quite common forward with a letter purporting to be written by me which I never wrote, there is another forgery. If you produce anything in writing or print saying it is so and so, the document not being genuine, a forgery has been committed. How do you make this a forgery when every piece of the evidence is genuine? If Judge Douglas does say the documents and quotations are false and forged he has a full right to do so, but until he does it specifically we don't know how to get at him. If he does say they are false and forged, I will then look further into it, and I presume I can procure the certificates of the proper officers that they are genuine copies; I have no doubt each of these extracts will be found exactly where Trumbull says it is. Then I leave it to you if Judge Douglas, in making his sweeping charge that Judge Trumbull's evidence is forged from beginning to end, at all meets the case if that is the way to get at the facts. I repeat again, if he will point out which one is a forgery, I will carefully examine it, and if it proves that any one of them is really a forgery it will not be me who will hold to it any longer. I have always wanted to deal with every one I meet candidly and honestly. If I have made any assertion not warranted by facts, and it is pointed out to me, I will withdraw it cheerfully. But I do not choose to see Judge Trumbull calumniated, and the evidence he has brought forward branded in general terms, "a forgery from beginning to end. This is not the legal way of meeting a charge. b i m \ S) \ I -iinnidfirtiii'-"

i 'A^f-

'^b^e^>; as the Democrats listened patiently and respectfully to Mr. Lincoln, that his friends will not interrupt me when I am answering him. When Mr. Trumbull returned from the East, the first thing he did when he landed at Chicago was to make a speech wholly devoted to assaults upon my public character and public action. Up to that time I had never alluded to his course in Congress, or to him directly or indirectly, and hence his assaults upon me were entirely without provocation and, without excuse. Since then he has been traveling : from one end of the State to the other repeating his false charge. I propose now to read it in his own language: "Now, fellow citizens, I make the distinct charge, that there was a preconcerted arrangement and plot entered into by the very men who now claim credit for opposition to a constitution formed and put in force without giving the people any opportunity to pass upon it. This, my friends, is a serious charge, but I charge it to right that the very men who traverse the country under banners proclaiming popular sovereignty, by design concocted a bill on purpose to force a constitution upon that people," In answer to some one in the crowd, who asked him a question, Trumbull said: . "And you want to satisfy yourself that he was in the plot to force a constitution upon that people? I will satisfy you I will cram the truth down any honest man's throat until he cannot deny it. And to the man who does deny it. I will crack the lie down his* throat till he shall cry enough (iv.) Benjamin Lincoln ^Hwutiw.xUjGeay^p.youJ^hAg?' It is preposterous it is the most damnable falsehood that man ever put on, to conceal a scheme to defraud and cheat the people out of their rights and then claim credit for it." That is the polite language Senator Trumbull applied to me, his colleague, when I was two hundred miles off'. OaESdww.) 'Why did he not speak out as boldly in the Senate of the United _____^^^ . ^^^ States, and cram the lie down my throat when I took it out, and although he took it out tho 1 "^^I^d the charge, first made by Bigler, and made him take it back. You all recollect how Bigler assaulted me when I was engaged in a hand to hand fight, resisting a scheme to force a constitution on : T 4. 1,- 1-rr, , = the people of Kansas against their will. He then provided which Trumbull alleges was in it attacked me with this charge; but I proved its utter falsity I submit to all intelligent persons, both friends of Judge Douglas and of myself, whether it is. The MODEKAKiB Threewinaw. / MniTiMirniin The point upon Judge Douglas"- "Is it so. The bill that went into his hands had the provision in it for a submission of the constitution to the people ; and I say its language amounts to an express provision for a submission, and that he took the provision out. He says it was known that the bill was silent on this particular; but I say, Judge Douglas, it was not silent when you got it. E)Mt "3EBissS&J It was vocal with the declaration when you got it, for a submission of the constitution to the people. And now, my direct question to Judge Douglas is, to answer why, if he deemed the bill silent on this point, he found it necessary to strike out those particular harmless words. If he had found the bill silent and without this provision, he might say what he does now. If he supposed it was implied that the constitution would be submitted to a vote of the people, how could these two lines so encumber the statute as to make it necessary to strike them out ? How could he infer that

a submission was still implied, after its express provision had been stricken from the bill? I find the bill vocal with the provision, while he silenced it. He other provision preventing a submission to a vote of the people, I ask, why did you first put Um? I ask him whether he took the original \- the bill? If he admits that he did take it, / ask him what he did it for ? It looks to us as if he had altered Jhe bill. If it looks differently to him if be has a different reason for his action from the one we as&ign him he can tell it. I insist upon knowing why he made the bill silent upon that point when it was vocal 1 before be put his hands upon it. falsity; nailed the slander to the counter, and made him take the back track. Therj*. is not an honest, man ih America who read that debate who will pretend that the charge is true. (Hmin-fmijUnug- lgi>) Trumbull was tnen present in the Senate, face to face with me, and why did he not then rise and repeat the charge, and say he would cram the lie down my throat. (Hn h-bbj ntfaid.) I tell you , . .that Trumbull then k, .-, ' iiiiwasa lie. He knewV 1 -was told, before my last paragraph, that sthat Toombs denied that there ever was a clause my time was within three minutes of being ; i the bill he brought forward calling for and 'i out. I presume it is expired now. I there- . requiring a submission of the Kansas ocnstitution ^' to the people. I will tell you what the tacts of the case were. I introduced a bill to authorize the people of Kansas to form a constitution, and come into the Union as a State whenever titiey should have the requisite population for a member of Congress, and Mr. Toombs proposed a sijbstitute, authorizing the people of Kansas, with there then populatioa of .only 25,000, to form a constitution, and come in at once. The question at issue was, whether we would admit Kansas with a population of 25,000, or, make her wait until she had the ratio expired fore close. Tha-4aaa^ SBNATCU DOUGLAS' SPBBOH. Ladies and Gentlemen .'- f-I had supposed that we assembled hereto-day for the purpose of a joint discussion between Mr. Lincoln and myself upon the political questions that now agitate the whole country. The rule of such discussions is, that the opening speaker shall touch upon all .the points he intends to discuss in order that his opponent, in reply, shall have the opportunity 6f answering them. Let me ask you what questions of public policy relating to the welfare of this State or the Union, has Mr. Lincoln discussed before you? f#eaaiioaj.<a<i gre*t applauSe.) feeWtitnii) jallovsiaie to-suggest that Bilenee-is-the best-eompli- ^aent you canpay me. I need my whole time, and. y,ourcheerig.onliyoeupiesit. Mr. Lincoln sim- ply contented .himself at the outset by saying, that he was not lo favor of social and political equahty between the white man and the negro, and did not desire the law so changed as to make the latter voters or eligible to office. I am glad that I have at last succeeded in getting an answer out of him upon this question of negro o.tizenship and eligi- bility to .office, for I have been trying to bring him to the point on It ever since this canvass com- menced. I will now call your attention to the question which Mr. Lincoln has occupied his entire time in discussing. He spent his -whole hour in retailing a charge made by Senator TrnmbuU against rne. The circumstances out of which that charge was manufacturedjoccurred prior to the last Presidential election, over two years ago. If the charge was true, why did not Trumbull make it in 1856, when entitling her to a representative in Congress, which was 93,420. That .was the point of dispute in the Committee of

Territories, to which both ioay bill and Mr. Toombs' substitute had been referred. I was overruled by a majority of jjie committee, mw proposition rejected, and Mr. Toombs' proposition to admit Kansas then, with her population of 25,000, adopted. Accordingly, a bill to carry out his idea "of immediate admission was reported as a substi- tute for mine the only points at issue being, as I have already said, the question of population, and the adoption of safeguards against frauds at the election. Trumbull knew this t..e whole Senate)Sriew it and hence he was silent at that time. He waited until I became engaged in this canvass and finding that I was showing up Lincoln's Abolitionism and negro equality doctrines {a)emm), that I was driving Lincoln to the wall, and white men would not support his rank Abolitionism, he came back from the Bast and trumped up a system of charges against me, hoping that I would be com- pelled to occupy my entire time in defending my- self so that I would not be able to show up the enormityof theprinciplesof the AhoUlionists. - Now, the only" reason, and the true reason, why Mr. Lin- I was discussing the questions of that day all over ; coin has occupied the whole of his first hour m tms this State with Lincoln and him, and when it was pertinent to the then issue. He was then as silent as the grave on the subject. If that charge was true, the time to have brought it forward was the canvass of 1856, the year when the Toombs bill passed the Senate. 'Wheu the fact^ were fresh in the public mind, when the Kansas question was the paramount question of the day,' and when such a charge would have had a material bearing on the election. 'Why did. he and Lincoln remain silent then, knowing that such a charge could be made i -----, - , , _ ::__-. _ and proven if true? Were they not false to you ! nents and traducing other men. woiwo.) rar. issue between Trumbull and myself is, to conceal from this vast audience the real questions which divide the two great parties. CUuiSwji***** I am not "oing to allow them to waste ranch of mv time with these personal matters. I have lived in'this State twenty five years, most of that time have been in public life, and my record is open to you all It that record is not enough to vindicate me from these petty, malicious assaults, I despise ever to be elected to oflice by slandering my oppo- and false to the country in going through that en tire campaign, concealing their knowledge of this enormou.i conspiracy which, Mr. Trumbull says, he then knew and would not tell ? (1 iilliHi|ll>ii| |iO Mr. Lincoln intimates in his speech, a good reason why Mr. Trumbull would not tell, for, he says, that it might be true, as I proved that it was at Jackson- ville, that Trumbull was also in the plot, yet that the lact of TrumbuU's being in th plot would not in any way relieve me. He illuSH-ates this argu- ment by supposing himself on trial for murder, and says that it would be no extenuatiEg circum- stance if, on his trial, another man was found to be a party to his crime. Well, if Trumbull was in the plot, and concealed it in order to escape the odium which would have fallen upon himself, I ask you whether you can believe him now when he turns Stale's evidence, and avows his own infamy in order to implicate me. {Aeriett hasf&sdst traitor. W^'Oouktiit believe ibyuuuIBJCi>eaWU-de<hatb, Am^ I am amazed that Mr. Line In should now come forward and endorse that charge, occupying his whole hour in reading Mr. TrumbuU's speech in support of it. Why, Task, does not Mr. Lincoln make a speech of his own instead

of taking up his time reading Trumbull's speech at Alton? I supposed that Mr. Lincoln was capable of making a public speech on his own account, or I should not have accepted the banter from him for a joint discussion. How about the charge? I am going to make my speech in my own way, and then let Lincoln ask you to elect him to the United States Senate to-day solely because he and Trumbull can slander me. Has he given any other reason? (No, not) Has he avowed what he was desirous to do in Congress on any one question? (No.) He desires to ride into office not upon his own merits; not upon the merits and soundness of his principles, but upon his success in fastening a stale old slander upon me. I wish you to bear in mind that up to the time of the introduction of the Toombs bill, and after its introduction, there had never been an act of Congress for the admission of a new State which contained a clause requiring its constitution to be submitted to the people, 'the general rule made the law silent on the subject, taking it for granted that the people would demand and compel a popular vote on the ratification of their constitution. Such was the general rule under Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson and Polk, under the Whig Presidents and the Democratic Presidents from the beginning of the government down, and nobody dreamed that an effort would ever be made to abuse the power thus confided to the people of a territory. For this reason our attention was not called to the fact of whether there was or was not a clause in the Toombs bill compelling submission, but it was taken for granted that the constitution would be submitted to the people whether the law compelled it or not. Now, I will read from the report made by me as Chairman of the Committee on Territories at the time I reported back the Toombs substitute to the bill.

of such

United States for nearly a year previous, and he did not return until about three years after. Yet Mr. Lincoln keeps repeating this charge of conspiracy against Mr. Buchanan, when the public records prove it to be untrue. Having proved it to be false as far as the Supreme Court and President Buchanan are concerned, I drop it, leaving the public to say whether I, by myself, without their concurrence, could have gone into a conspiracy with them. My friends, you see that the object clearly is to conduct the canvass on personal matters, and hunt me down with charges that are proven to be false by the public records of the country. I am willing to throw open my whole public and private life to the inspection of any man, or all men who desire to investigate it. Having resided among you twenty-five years, during nearly the whole of which time a public man, exposed to more assaults, perhaps more abuse than any man living of my age, or, who ever did live, and having survived it all and still commanded your confidence, I am willing to trust to your knowledge of me and my public conduct without making any more defense against these assaults. / Fellow citizens, I came here for the purpose of discussing the leading

political topics which now agitate the country, I have no charges to make against Mr. Lincoln, none against Mr. Trumbull, and none against any man who is a candidate, except in repelling their assaults upon me. If Mr. Lincoln is a man of bad character, I leave you to find it out; if his votes in the past are not satisfactory, I leave others to ascertain the fact; if his course on the Mexican war was not in accordance with your notions of patriotism and fidelity to our own country as against a public enemy, I leave you to ascertain the fact. I have no assaults to make upon him except to trace his course on the questions that now divide the country and engross so much of the people's attention. You know that prior to 1854 this country was divided into two great political parties, one the Whig, the other the Democratic. I, as a Democrat for twenty years prior to that time, had been in public discussion in this State as an advocate of Democratic one of Clay's Compromise measures as they passed the Senate and the House and were approved by President Fillmore. Previous to that time, the city council had passed resolutions nullifying the act of Congress and instructing the police to withhold all assistance from its execution; but the people of Chicago listened to my defense, and like candid, frank, conscientious men, when they became convinced that they had done an injustice to Clay, Webster, Cass, and all of us who had supported those measures, they repealed their nullifying resolutions and declared that the laws should be executed and the supremacy of the constitution maintained. Let it always be recorded in history to the immortal honor of the people of Chicago, that they returned to their duty when they found that they were wrong, and did justice to those whom they had blamed and abused unjustly. When the legislature of this State assembled that year, they proceeded to pass resolutions approving the Compromise measures of 1850. When the Whig party assembled in 1852 at Baltimore in National Convention for the last time, to nominate Scott for the Presidency, they adopted as a part of their platform the Compromise measures of 1850 as the cardinal plank upon which every Whig would stand and by which he would regulate his future conduct. When the democratic party assembled at the same place one month after to nominate General Pierce, we adopted the same platform so far as those Compromise measures were concerned, agreeing that we would stand by those glorious measures as a cardinal article in the democratic faith. Thus you see that in 1852 all the old Whigs and all the old Democrats stood on a common plank so far as this slavery question was concerned, differing on other questions. Now, let me ask how is it, that since that time so many of you Whigs have wandered from the true path marked out by Clay and carried out broad and wide by the great Webster? How is it that so many old line Democrats have abandoned the old faith of their party and joined with Abolitionism and Free-soilism to overturn the platform of the old Democrats, and the platform of the old Whigs? You cannot deny that since 1854, there has been a / *. ' cratic principles, and I can appeal with confidence a great revolution on this one question. How has it to every old line Whig within the bearing of my ^ . g ^ brought about? I answer, that no sooner was voice to bear testimony that during all that period ; je sod grown green over the grave of the immortal fought you Whigs like a man on every question .lalClay, no sooner was the rose

planted on the that sepaifated the tw. parties. I had the highest tomb ot the Godlike Webster, than many of the respect for Henry Clay as a gallant party leader, as leaders of the Whig party, such as Seward, of New an eminent statesman, and as one of the bright oir- York and his followers, led off and attettmted to ' naments of this country ; but 1 conscientiously be-, aboliionlze the Whig party, and transfer Sll your ; lieved that the Democratic party was right on the old Whigs bound hand ami foot into the abclition questions which separated the Democrats from the ^atnp. Seizing hold of the temporary exciteinent , WhiffS. The man does not live who can say that I produced in this country by the int'oduction of the I. ^ ____ll____;i..a!r-----ni . rv.,-!..l Ttrt^ C,..... ' -i-?-i----- ;- ii (ever personally assailed Henry Clay or Daniel Web. ^ ster, or any one of the leaders of that great party, whilst I ccmbatted with all my energy the measures they advocated. What did we differ about in those days? Did Whigs and Democrats differ about this j slavery question. On the contrary, did we not, in 11850, unite to a man in favor ot that system of com- promise measures which Mr., Clay introduced, Webster defended, Oass supported, and FiUmore approved and made the law ot the land by his signature. While we agreed on those oompromisa measures we ditiered about a bank, the tarifi, distribution, the specie circular, the sub-treasury, and other questions of that description. Now let me ask you which one of those questions on which Whigs and Democrats then differed now remains to i divide two great parties. Every one of those ques- tions which divided Whigs ana Democrats has passed away, the country has out-grown, them, they have passed into history. Hence it is immaterial whether you were right or I was right oh the bank, the sab-treasury, and other questions, because they no longer continue living issues. What then has taken the place of those questions about which we once differed ? The slavery question has now be- come the leading and controlling issue; that ques- tion on which you and I agreed, on which the Whigs and Democrats united, has now become the leading issue between the national Democracy: on the one side, and the Eepublican or Abolition party on the other. Just recollect for a moment the memorable con- test of 1850, when this country was agitated from its centre to its circumference by the slavery agita- tion. All eyes in this nation were then turned to the three great lights that survived the days ot the revolution. They looked to Clay, then in retire- ment at Ashland, and to Webster and Cass in the United States Senate. Clay had retired to Ash- land, having, as he supposed, performed his mis- sion oi earth, and was preparing himself for a bet- ter sphere of existence in another world. In that retirement he heard the discordant, harsh and grating sounds of sectional strife and dis- union and he aroused and came forth and resumed his seat in the Senate, that great itheatre of his great deeds. From the moment that Clay arrived among us he became the leader ol all the Union men whether whigs or democrats. For nine months we each assembled, each day, in the council chamber, Clay m the chair, wit,h ^ Cass upon his right hand and Webber upon his ^, left and the democrats and whigs gathered around, ' forgetting differences, and only animated by one common patriotic sentiment to devise means and measures by which we could defeat the mad and revolutionary scheme of the uOththeru abolitionista and southern disunionists. apppi.) We did de- vise those means. Clay br^^t

them forward Cass advocated them, the Union democrats and Union whigs voted for them, FiUmore signed them, and they gave peace and quiet to the country Those Compromise measures of 1850 were founded unOD the great fundamental principle that the people of each State and each territory ought to be left free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in iheir own way subject only to the Federal Con- ;mutToB"(5B^-W^W),. I will ask every old lme DemocratBand every old line Whig within the hearing of my voice, if I have not truFy stated the issues as they then presented themselves to the country You recollect, that the abolitionists raised a howl of indignation and cried / orvengeance and ae destruction of Democrats and Whigs both who ijebraska bill, the disappointed politicians in tho ijemocralic party, united with the disappointed po- liticians in the Whig party, and endeavored to form B nt-w party composed of all the abolitionists, of abolitinnize'd Democrats and abolitionized Whigs, bandrd together in an abolition filattform. And who led that crusade against National prin- ciples in this State? I answer. Abraham Lincoln On behalf of the Whigs, and.Lymaa Trumbull on behalf of the Democrats, form, d a scheme by which they would abolitioniza the two great parties in this State on condition that Lincoln should be gent to the United States Senate in place of Gen. Shields, and thit Trumbull should go to Co: gress from the Belleville district, until 1 wi.uld be accommodating enough either to die or resign for his benetii., and then he was to go to the Senate in my place. You all remember that daring the year 1854 these two worlhy irenilemen, Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Trumbull, rne an Old Line Whig and the dthe? an Old Line ijemocrat, were huTitinz in partnership to elect a legislature s;ainst the "Demcoratio party. I oan- vas-^ed the State that year from the time 1 returned home ivmil the election came off, and spoke in everv ciunty that 1 could reach during that pe- riod' In the ponheru part of the State I found Lnvolos allv, in the person of Fred. Doco- IASS. THE NEGEO, preaching abolition doctrines, while Lincoln was discussing the same principles down here, and Trumbull, a little farther down, was advocating the election of members to the legislature who would act in concert with Lincoln's and Fred. Douglass' friends. I witnessed an effort made at Chico'go by Lincoln's then associates, and now supporters, to put Fred. Douglass, the negro, on the stand at a Dehioorttic meeting to reply to the illustrious Gen. Cass when he was addressing the people there. plL.....\\fv\.) They had the same ne.ro hunting me down, and they now have a negro traversing the northern counties of the State, and speaking in behalf of Lincoln. (llitiUn>^<'H>!&.<<u-dia^aee.to-.the!Bt4tete^ - Wy>^) Lincoln knows that when we were at IVeeiiort in Joint discussion, there was a distin- guished colored friend of his there then who was on the stump for him, jJahimteJltJailflWe^ and who. made a speech there the night before we spoke,? end another the night after, a short distance from Freeport. ir favor of Lincoln, and in order to show how much interest the colored brethren felt in the success of iheir brother Abe, (RrttnMdi lungtitw.) I hav. with me here, and would read if it would not occupv too much of my time, a speech made by Fri'd Di: ilass in Poughketpsie, N. Y., a short,time since to a large convention, in which he conjures all the friends of negro equality and nearo citizenship to rally as one man around Abraham Lincoln, the pei fjct embodiment of their principles, and by all means '.) defeat Stephen A, Douglas, (It einii'l li

4Mw,,ife..') Thus you find that this Republican party in the northern part of the State had colored ' gentlemen for their advocates in 1854, in company with Lincoln and Trumbull, as they have now. When in October, 1854, I went down to Springfield to attend the State fair, I found the leaders of this party all assembled together under the title of an Anti- Nebraska meeting. It was Black Republicans up north, and Anti Nebraska at Springfield. I found Lov. J. Ly, a high priest of Abolitionism, and Lincoln one of the leaders who was towing the old line Whigs into the abolition camp, and Trumbull, Sidney Breese, and Gov. Eynolds, all making speeches against the Democratic party and myself, at the same place and in the same cause. ("Ui^insaii Ijilirn ^^T frnftffimte\r>Mm.I The same men who are now fighting the Democratic the _ supported those Compromises measures of 1800. When I returned home to Chicago, I found the cm- _ ^^^ zens inflamed and infuriated against the authors of are now fighting the Democratic party and the re- those great measures. Being "the only man in that singular D^mooratio nominees in this State were fought by who was held responsible for affirmative votes in us then. They did not then acknowledge that on" all those measures, I came forward and addressed they had become abolitionists, and many of them the assembled inhabitants, defended each and every den of it now. Breese, Dougherty, and Reynolds tell

III IP

-- ^K!fiV 4 g^ for the Abolition ticket, and swearing that he was a fooda Whig as he ever was; (** ' j) and that Trumbull went all over the State making pro-claims for the old Democratic, and trying to coax them in- to the Abolition camp, -----..... ^' *"" swearing by this were then fighting the Democracy under the title of Anti Nebraska men, and now they are fighting the Democracy under the pretence that they are pure Democrats. (WijlhtCT.) Saying that they are authorized to have every office holder in election of Douglas: C^ss of the Democratic ticket in preference to the Abolition ticket for members of Congress, State officers, members of the Legislature, or any office. ^"""";f/ gr'^o""a;r Abolition "laws, and sustained in the State. They circumvented the State against us. ^f^sta for office. State and national. Now, in Illinois, as they are doing now. owning different ^=""e ga" i^ attempted to be played over Dimes and different principles in different localities, ^^^ ^>ij | n i, Lincoln and Trumbull made captives are authorized to have every once- JI'^y^--^^^ t^e upturned hand, that he was still a Illinois one-sided who prefers the free X.";"."^ always intended to be, and that Douglass to the contrary of Lincoln, or the other. I^:"^2'="!; i/ w^ rtesert the Democratic party. would he desert the Democratic party, s .. v.,^, \ He "ot your votes to elect an Abolition legislature, which passed Abolition resolutions attempted to pass Abolition laws -' --"^^ Abolitionists for office. State and

X but having a common object in view, viz; the defeat of all men holding national principles in opposition to this sectional Abolition party. They controlled the legislature in 1854, and when it assembled in Springfield they proceeded to elect a United States Senator, all voting for Lincoln with one or



two exceptions, which exceptions prevented them, the old Whigs and old Democrats and earned them into the Abolition camp where Father Giddens, the high priest of Abolitionism, received and christened them in the dark cause, just as fast as they were brought in. (Ill., Har.) addings found the converu So numerous that he had to have assistance, and he sent for John P. Hale from quite electing him. And why should they not? Mr. Hale and other Abolitionists, and they elect him? Had not Trumbull agreed that Lincoln favored with Lovejoy and Fred. Douglass, should have Shields' place? Had not the abolitionists agreed to it? Was it not the solemn compact, the condition on which Lincoln agreed to abolish the old Whigs that he should be Senator? Still, Trumbull having control of a few abolitionized Democrats, would not allow them to vote for Lincoln on any one ballot, and thus support him for some time within one or two votes of an election, until he worried his Lincoln's friends, and compelled them to drop him and elect Trumbull in violation of the bargain. (O. J. M.) I desire to read; you a piece of testimony in confirmation of the notoriously public one which I have stated to you. Col. Jas. H. Hatfield, of Springfield, is and for twenty years has been the confidential personal and political friend and manager of Mr. Lincoln. Mr. Hatfield: is this very day the candidate of the Republican or Abolition party for Congress against the gentleman? Major Thomas L. Harris, in the Springfield district, and is making speeches for Lincoln and against me. I will read you the testimony of Mr. Hatfield about this bargain between Lincoln and Trumbull when they undertook to abolish Whigs and Democrats only four years ago. Mr. Hatfield being mad at Trumbull for having played a Yankee trick on Lincoln, exposed the bargain in a public speech two years since, and I will read the published report of that speech, the correctness of which Mr. Lincoln will not deny: "The Verdict", Abolitionists, Know Nothings, and renegade Democrats. This is the sole compact for the purpose of overthrowing the free State against the Democracy on this point: 1st, to elect Mr. Lincoln, and all combine and elect Mr. Trumbull to Congress, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747,

to support him for the Senate, and then cheated him as he does now, (,iviiL..ijl-Li-iu'l"li""i) wtbeu rumbuU comes forward and makes charges against me. Ton could not then prove TrumbuU an honest man either by Lin- coln, by Matheny, or by any of Lincoln's friends. They charged everywhere that TrumbuU had cheat- ed them out of the bargain, and Lincoln found sure enough that it was a iad ba-rgairi to contract and conspire with rogues. (hm^s^K.) And now I will explain to you what has been a mystery all over the State and Onion, the reason why Lincoln was nominated for the United States Senate hy the Black Republican convention. You know I have never been usual for any party, or any cot:ventioQ to nominate a candidate for United States rienator. Probably this was the first time that suoh a thing was ever done. The Black Re- pubUciin convention had not been called for that purpose, but to nomiiate a State ticket, and every man was surprised and many disgusted when Lin- coln wa-i nominated. Archie Williams thought he was entitled to it. Browning knew that he deserved it Wentworth was certain that he would get it, J'eok had hopes, Judd felt sure that he was the man and Faimer had claims and had m.ade ar- ra-ijetncnts to secure it; but to their utter amaze- ment L-ncoln was nominated by the convention, ugufiiKm) and not only that, but hs received the ioniroaiioo unanimonsly, by a resolution declaring that Abraiiam Linwln was "the first, last, and only choice" of the Itepublican party. How did come on, and with Lovejoy the negro, helped to bapte these new converts as Lincoln TrumbuU, Breese, Reynolds, and Dough- erty could capture them and bring them withm the Abolition clutch. Gentlemen, they are now arounil m"king the same kind of speeches. TrumbuU was down m Monroe county the other day assailing m^ and making a speech in i-avor oi Lincoln, and I will Show you under what notice his meeting was caUed. You see these people are Black Bapublicans or Abolitionists up North, while atlSpnngheld to day, tliey d-41-e not callthsir convention "Republican, but are obliged to say "a convention of all men opposed to the Democratic party ' and m Monroe county andlower Egypt TrumbuU advertises their meetings as follows: -"A msetins of the Free Democracy will take place at Water. loo. on Monday. September 12th inst,. whereat Hon. Lyman ^ TrumbuU. Hon. .John Baker, and others, will aidre:8 the people upon the different political topics of the day, Mem- bersofall pftities are cordial y iovied to be present, and hear and determine for themselves, , September9.1858. The FkeeDKiuoCEiOT.-" Did vou ever before hear of this new party called the " Free Democracy?" What object have these Black Republicans in changing their name in every county ? '(Ton cheat jjiiipli.) They have one name in the Northj another in the centre, and another in the South. When used to practice law before my distinguished judi oial friend, whom I recognize in the crowd before me, if a man was charged with horse stealing and the proof showed that he went by one name in Ste- phenson county, another in Sangamon, a third in Monroe, and a fourth in Randolph, we thought that the lact of his changing bis name so often to avoid detection, was pretty strong evidence of his guilt. I would like to know why it is that this great free soil abolition party is not willing to avow the :-ar^e name in all partso'f the State? (I'bay dnw~gf..) ' this party believes that its course is Just, why dot" it not avow the same principle in the North, and iu ; the South, in the East and in the West, wherever the Ameiioan flag waves over

American soil A VOICE. The party does not call itself Black Ei. publican in the North. I Mr. Dohqlas Sir, if .you will get a copy of it i paper published at Waukegan, fifty miles from Cl cago, which advocates the election of Mr. Lincol . and ha* his name flying at its masthead, you w find that it declares that " this paper is devoted the cause of Biacle HfpuUicanism. (fio*lf4rtHi"!T lj| 'itii8rnjj lMrfl) I had a copy ot it and intended bring it down bete into Egypt to let you see whv name the party rallied under up in the Northei part of the State, aid to convince you that thei principles are as different in the two sections of thc^ State as is their name. I am sorry that 1 have mis laid it and have not got it here. Their principles in the North arc jet black, (Inngh*""")^ in the centre they are in color a decent mulatto, ^eiioi^cd lfmijilatar,) and in lower Egypt they are almost white. (^ltttsilUMator-) . Why, I admired many of the this occur? ^__. Why, because they could not get Linco"i n"s'friends to make another bargain with " rogue" " (Innfl^* .) unless the whole party would - come up'as one man and pledge their honor that ' they would stand by Lincoln first, last and all the i time and that he should not be cheated by Lovejoy i this time, as he was by TrumbuU before. Thus, oy passing this resolution, the Abolitionists are all for | him Lovejoy and Farnsworth are canvassing for him' G;diliBgsis ready to come here in his behalf, and'tne negro speakers are already on the stamp for him, and he is sure not t > be cheated this time. He would not go into the arrangement uotU he got their bond for it, and TrumbuU is compelled now to take the stump, get up false charges against me, and travel all over the State to try and elect Lin- coln in order to keep Lincoln's friends quiet about the bargain in which TrumbuU cheated them four years aSo, You see, now, why it is that Lincoln and TrumbuU are so mighty fond of each other (l'iuiiudua'l>uel*"t.) Thy have entered into a conspiracy to break me down by these assaults on my public character, in order to draw my at- tention from a fair exposure of the mode in which they attempted to abolitionize the old Whig and the old Democratic parties and lead them captive into the Abolition camp. CSlujiijta, CSjST^ent around here four years ago making speeches to vou. and tellinsr vou that vou .should all white sentiments contained in Lincoln's speech at Jonesboro, and could not help but contrast them with the speeches of the same distinguished orator made in the Northern part of the State. Down ht -e he denies that the Black Republican party is oppo- sed to the admission of any fliore slave States, under any circumstances, atd says that they are willing to allow the people of each State when it wants to come into the Union, to do just as it pleases on the question of slavery. In the North, you find Love joy, ^if candidate for Congress in the Blooming- ton joTStrict, Farnsworth, their candidate in the Chicago-district, and Vi ashburne, their candidate in the Galena district, all declaring that never will they consent, under any circutnstances, to admit another slave State, tven if the people want it. (i^iii^llini^o.) Thus, while they avow one set of prin- ciples up there, they avow another and entirely dif- ! I terent set down here. And here let me recall to Mr. Lincoln the scriptural qupt*tjon which he has applied to the federal governni-ent, that a house di- vided against itself cannot stand, and ask him how does he expect this Abolition party to stand when 1 in one-half of the State^it advocates a set of prin- ciples which it has repudiated in the other half. I am told that I have but eight minutes more. I would like to talk to you an hour and

a half longer, but I will make the best use I can of the remaining eight minutes, Mr. Lincoln said in his first remarks that he was not in favor of the social and political equality of the negro with the white man. Everywhere in the north he has declared that he was not in favor of the social and political equality of the negro, but he would not say whether or not he was opposed to negroes voting and negro citizenship. I want to know whether he is for or against negro citizenship? He declared his utter opposition to the Dred Scott decision, and advanced as a reason that the court had decided that it was not possible for a negro to be a citizen under the constitution of the United States. If he is opposed to the Dred Scott decision, that reason he must be in favor of conferring the right and privilege of citizenship upon the negro! I have been trying to get an answer from him on that point, but have never yet obtained one, and I will show you why. In every speech he made in the north he quoted the Declaration of Independence to prove that all men were created equal, and insisted that the phrase "all men," included the negro as well as the white man, and that the equality rested upon Divine law. Here is what he said on that point:

"

"I am much interested to know how this Old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle and making exceptions to it where will it stop. If one man says it does not mean a negro, why may not another say it does not mean some other man? If that declaration is not the truth let us get the statement in which we find it and bear it out!" Lincoln maintains there that the Declaration of Independence asserts that the negro is equal to the white man and that under Divine law, and if he believes so it was rational for him to advocate negro citizenship, which, when allowed, puts the negro on an equality under the law. (He is, in my opinion, a negro is not a citizen, cannot be, and ought not to be, under the constitution of the United States. I will not even qualify my opinion to meet the declaration of one of the Judges of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case, "that a negro descended from African parents, who was imported into this country as a slave, is not a citizen, and cannot be." I say that this government was established on the white basis. It was made by white men, for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and never should be administered by any except white men. (Lincoln.) I declare that a negro ought not to be a citizen, whether his parents were imported into this country as slaves or not, or whether or not he was born here, it does not depend upon the place a negro's parents were born, or whether they were slaves or not, but upon the fact that he is a negro, belonging to a race incapable of self government, and for that reason ought not to be on an equality with white men. Well! My friends, I am sorry that I have not time to pursue this argument further, as I might have done but for the fact that Mr. Lincoln compelled me to occupy a portion of my time in repelling those gross slanders

and falsehoods that Trumbu has invented against me and put in circulation. In conclusion, let me ask you why should this government be divided by a geographical line arraying all men North in one great hostile party against all men South? Mr. Lincoln tells you, in his speech at Springfield, "that a house divided against itself cannot stand; that this government divided into free and slave States, cannot endure permanently; that they must either be all free or all slave; all one thing or all the other." Why cannot this government endure divided into free and slave States, as our fathers made it? When this government was established by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jay, Hamilton, Franklin, and the other sages and patriots of that day, it was composed of free States and slave States, bound together by one common constitution. We have existed and prospered from that day to this thus divided, and have increased with a rapidity never before equalled in wealth, the extension of territory, and all the elements of power and greatness until we have become the first nation on the face of the globe. Why can we not thus continue to prosper? We can if we will live up to and execute the government upon those principles upon which our fathers established it. During the whole period of our existence Divine Providence has smiled upon us, and showered upon our nation richer and more abundant blessings than have ever been conferred, upon any other. The Union-Boogles' tenure here expired, and the South- Ojigadaii. the matter amidst the applause. Mr. Lincoln's KejoIndcr. As-Mr, Lincoln stepped forth, the crowd sent up three roiling cheers. Now, I.....n iiiiiiirl, the fellow Citizens-li follows as a matter of course that a half-hour answer to a speech of an hour-and-a-half can be but a very hurried one I shall only be able to touch upon a few of the points suggested by Judge Douglas, and give them a brief attention, while I shall have to totally omit others for the want of time. Judge Douglas has said to you that he has not been able to get from me an answer to the question whether I am in favor of negro-citizenship, so far as I know, the Judge never asked me the question before. He shall have no occasion to ever ask it again, for I tell him very frankly that I am not in favor of negro citizenship. This furnishes me an occasion for saying a few words upon the subject. I mentioned in a certain speech of mine which has been printed, that the Supreme Court had decided that a negro could not possibly be made a citizen, and without saying what was my ground of complaint in regard to that or whether I had any ground of complaint! Judge Douglas has from that thing manufactured nearly every thing that he ever says about my disposition to produce an equality between the negroes and the white people. The Illinoisian. If any one will read my speech, he will find I mentioned that as one of the points decided in the course of the Supreme Court opinions, but I did not state what objection I had to it. But Judge Douglas tells the people what my objection was when I did not. Now my opinion is that the State here has the power to make a negro a citizen under the Constitution of the United States if they choose. The Dred Scott decision decides that they have not that power. If the State of Illinois had that power I should be opposed to it. I have said: 'gaad, ^, , '%, od ^', aaa..a, | >plaH. That is all I have to say about Judge Douglas has told me that he heard my speeches north and my speeches south that he had heard me at Ottawa and at

Freeport in the north, and recently at Jonesboro in the south and there was a very different cast of sentiment in the speeches made at the different points I will not charge upon Judge Douglas that he wil- fully misrepresents me, but I call upon every fair-minded man to take these speeches and read them, and I dare him to point oat any difERENCE between, my printed fpeedtes north and south ^Ttfat.fhgariina. While I am here perhaps I ought to say a word, if I have the time, in re- gard to the latter portion of the Judge's speech '. which was a sort of declamation in reference to . my having said I entertained the belief that this eovernment would not endure, half slave and l.alf free. I have said so and I did not say it without what seemed to me to be good reasons. It perhaps would require more time than I have now set forth these reasons in detail; but let me ask you a few questions. Have we ever had any peace on this slavery question V M^^w When are we to have peace upon it it it is kept in the position it now oceupies? ^tf*r. How are we ever to have peace upon ilV That is an important question. To be sure if we will all stop and allow Judge Douglas and his iriends to march on in their present career until they plant the institution all over the nation, here and wherever else our hag waves, and we acquiesce in it, there will be peace, iicut let me ask Judge Douglas how he is going to get the people to do that? ilp*<la, They have been wrai.gling over tiis question 'for at least forty years. This was the cause of the agita- tion resulting in the Missouri C5mpromise this produced the troubles at the annexation of Texas, in the acquisition of the territory ac- quired in the Mexican war. Again, this was the trouble which was quieted by the uom- promise of 1850, when it was settled " forever," as both the great political parties declared in their National Gcnveationa. That "forever" turned out to be just four years, InughUr wjen Judge Douglas himself reopened it. flrnint'nwni iii*pkM,i4iM.#lBbiiiiHkfo," ^.^(^?J When is it likely to come to an end? He introduced the Nebraska bill in 1854 to put another end to the slavery agitation. He promised that it would finish it all up immedi- ately, and he has never made a speech since until he got into a quarrel with the President about the Lecompton Constitution, in which he has not declared that we are just at the end of th^ slavery agitation. But in one speech, I thinklast winter, he didsaythat he didn't quite see when the end of the slavery agitation would come. I LihiiifthtiPii: an,4-rfhwbtcgj Now he tells us again that it is all over, and the people of Kansas have voted down ilie Lecompton Con- stitution. How is it over? That was only one of the attempts at putting an end to the slavery agitation one of these "final settlements." {tflneifmi Innghtar. Is Kansas in the Union ? Has she formed a Oonatitution that she is likely to come in under V Is not the slavery agitation still an open question in that Territory? Has the voting down of that Coiiatitution put an end to all the trouble ? Is that more likely to settle it thaa every one of these previous attempts to ffiii^? slavery agitation. frifijUftL-^^itfl," **Wj How, at this day in the history of the world we can no more foretell where the end of this slavery agitation will be than we can see the end of the world itself. The Nebraska-Kan- sas bill was introduced four years and a halt ago, and if the agitation is ever to come to an end, we may say we are four years and a half nearer the end. So, too, we can say we are four years and a half nearer the end of the world; and we can just as clearly see the end of the world as we can see the end of this agitation.

4aBl*a^ 1 The Kansas settlement did not conclude it. If Kansas should sink today, and leave a great vacant space in the earth's surface, this vexed question would still be among us. I say, then, there is no way of putting an end to the slavery agitation amongst us but to put it back upon the basis where our fathers placed it, namely Mir no way but to keep it out of our new Territories im- Mw*d-pplaBc to restrict it forever to the old States where it now exists. 'IVamandouo P"bKminT?Sn^esUniebeiief tuat it is in the course of ultimate extinction. That is one way of putting an end to the slavery agitation. T "i" "r!"^"" y i^ fo"" "S to surrender and let Judge Douglas and his friends have their way and plant slavery over all the States- cease Bpeakmg of it as in any way a wrong regard slavery as one of the common matters of property, and speak of negroes as we do of our horses and cattle. But while it drives on in its state of progress as it is now driving.", and as it has driven for the last live years, I have ventured the opinion, and I say to-day, that we will have no end to the slavery agitation until it takes one turn or the other. fAafJaiiaBl I do Eot mean that when it takes a turn towards ultimate extinction it will be in a day, nor in a year nor in two years. I do, not suppose that in the most peaceful way ultimate extinction would occur less than a hundred years at the least; m%M% It will ooobf ig the best way for both races in God's own good time, I have no doubt. ,I>p|i>lna< . But, my friends, I have used up more of my time than I intended', on this point Now, in regard to this matter about TrumbuU ' and myself having made a bargain to sell out the entire Whig and Democratic parties in 1854 Judge Douglas brings forward no evidence to sustain his charge, except the speech Matheny IS said to have made in 1856, in which he told a cock-and-bull story of that sort, upon the same moral principles that Judge Douglas tells it here to-day. Ma"PP*iw^ . This is the simple truth. I do not care greatly for the story, but this IS the truth of it, and I have twice told Judge Douglas to his face, that from beginning to end there is not one word of truth in it iThnn^mioLapptanagf. I have called upon him for the proof, and he does not at all meet me au TrumbuU met him upon that of w-aich we were just talking, by producing the record. He did not bring the record, because there was no record for him to bring. ftwwdnU,8Juti. . When he asks if I am ready to indorse TrumbuU's veracity after he has broken a bargain with me I reply that it TrumbuU had broken a bargain with me, I would not be likely to indorse his veracity ; I ought to indorse "iT^imr^irr _ , but I am ready -----, _ is veracity because neither in that thing, nor in any other, in all the years that I have known Jjyman TrumbuU, have I known him to fail of his word or tell a falsehood, I am or smaU^ teiatKiheoiiiiB . It is for this reason that I indorse Lyman TrumbuU. Mr. James BROVftf (Douglas I lost Masteri)-- What does Ford's history say about him ? il

'-s^ Y" Mit ,iN'C()i,N Some gentleman asks me what O / Foid'ii History says about him. iMy own recollection is, that Ford speaks of Trumbull in very "" I disrespectful terms in several portions of his book, and that he talks a great deal worse of Judge Uoiiijlas. Hfiiirn liiiUimlih.....I up \ ,Jlla**"" I '(ilT you, sir, to the history for examination. giJMaBk judge Douglas complains, at considerable ,

lenKti't, about a disposition on the part of Trum- ' bull and myself to attack him personally. I want to attend to that suggestion a moment. I don't want to L'e unjustly accused of dealing jlliberally or niiCairly with an adversary, eitner in court, or in a political canvass, or anywhere else. I would despise myseU' if I supposed myself readji to deal less liberally with an adversary than I was was willing to be trea*ed myself. Judge Douglas, in'a general way, without putting it in a directshape, revives the old cha^'ge against me, in reference to the Mexican War. He does not take the re- sponsibility of putting it in a very definite form, but makes a general reforence to it. That charge is more thau ten years old. He complains of Trumbull and myself, beciuso he says we bring charges against hinvsor two years old. He knows, too, that in regard to the Mexican War story, the more respectable pa lers of his own ^arty throughout the State havcj been compelled to ta'ke it back and actaowfedgi; that it was a lie. Here Mr. Lincoln turnrdto' the crowd on the platform, and selecting Hon. Orlando B. Ficklin, led him forward and said : I do not mean to do anythii ig with Mr. Pickliu except to present his face an d tell you that lie personally knov's it to be a lie! He was a mem- ber of Oongress at.the only tir.ae I was in Con- gress, and he (Ficklin) knows that whenever there was an attempt to procure a vote of mine which would indorse the origin and justice of the war, I refused to give such indorsei nent, and vot- ed against it; but I never voted a; jainst the sup- plies for the army, and he knoirs, as well as Judge Douglas, that whenever a do liar was asked by way of compensation or otlie twice, for the benefit of the soldiers, 7 gave- ait the votes that Ficklin or Douskit did, and perhapt more. 0\$^M|i Ma. FicKLiM My friends, I wish to say this in reference to the matter. Mr. Lincoln and myself are just as good personal friends as Judge : Douglas and myseif. In referense to this Mex- I loan war, my recollection is that when Ashmun's | resolution (amendmsiit) was oil'eredby Mr. Ash- ; muu of Massachusetts, in which he declared that the Mexican war was un.aecessarily and uncotf- : stitutionally commenced .by ths President my recollection is that Mr. Lincoln voted lor that' resolution. Mb. Li.nooln That is the truth. Now you all i remember that was a resolution censuring the President for the manner in which tie war was i begun.. You know they have charged that 1 vo- ; ted against the supplies, by which 1 starved the . y soldiers who were out lighting the battles of their country. I say that FickISu knows it is false, j When that charge was brought forward by the Chicago; rwftss.jtheSpringfieij Seyister (Douglas : organ) reminded the Takes that the charge real- ' ly applied to John Henry; and I do know that ' John Henry ^5 now Tnahing speeci^es andJlercely battling for Judge Douglas. LflB4aptaus. ! If the Judge njw says that he ofiersthis as a sort of a set- cfiTto what I said to day in refer- t ence to TrumbuU's charge, then I reiiaind him 1 that he made this charge before I sMii a word t about TrumbuU's. He brought this forward at : Ottawa, the first time we met face to face j and ' in the openingspeechthat JudgDouglasmade, he attacked me in regard to a matter ten years old. Isn't he a pretty man to be whining about people making charges against him only tioo ^yearsold. UOSmI The Judge thinks it Li altogether wrong that I should have dwelt upon this charge of Trum- buU's at all. I gavo the apology for doing so , in my opening speech. Perhaps it didn't ttix your attention. I said that wltén Judge Doug- las was speaking at places wher*

I spoke on the succeeding day, he used very harsh language about this charge. Two or three times after- wards I said I had confidence in Judge Trumbull's veracity and intelligence; and my own opinion was, from what I knew of the character of Judge Trumbull, that he would vindicate his position, and prove whatever he had stated to be true. This I repeated two or three times; and then I dropped it, without saying another thing more on the subject for weeks perhaps a month. I passed it by without noticing it until I found at Jacksonville, Judge Douglas, in the plenitude of his power, is not willing to answer. Judge Trumbull and let me alone; but he comes out there and uses this language: "He should not hereafter occupy his time in refuting such charges made by Trumbull, but that Lincoln, having indorsed the character of Trumbull for veracity, he should hold him (Lincoln) responsible for the slanders." What was Lincoln to do? Judge Douglas. Did he not do right, when he had the fit opportunity of meeting Judge Douglas here, to tell him he was ready for the responsibility? I inquire of a candid audience whether you doing thus Judge Douglas was not the assailant rather than I? "Xmas a fine time to meet!" Here I meet him face to face and say I am ready to take the responsibility so far as it rests upon me. Having done so, I ask the attention of this audience to the question whether I have succeeded in sustaining the charge {Ilyo %!Aijiaas^, and whether Judge Douglas has at all succeeded in rebutting it? Jly, uA. ew>^**a8yei' You all heard me call upon him to say which of these pieces of evidence was a forgery? Does he say that what I present here as a copy of the original Toombs bill is a forgery? AiyfasijMc" Does he say that what I present as a copy of the bill reported by himself is a forgery? Xiit^ __y;^S>v^WBi" Or what is presented as a transcript from the Globe, of the quotations from Bigler's speech is a forgery? (K<Of%aUk> Does he say the quotations from his own speech are false? "r>t^-~.V. "mjiy Docs he vn Tin-, Il ci'ipr ir. iu iiii:n ,iil'< ^tr^ii is a forgery? Laud efica of J' na^no," ^He didn't toiy one of them." I would then like to know how it comes about, that when each piece of a story is true, the whole story turns out false? !!^| M)^ xhefiMANflijunshtar'. I take it these people have some sense; they see plainly that Judge Douglas is playing outtletish, jMfhtmai a small species of fish that has no mode of defending itself when pursued except by throwing out a black fluid, which makes the water so dark the enemy cannot see it and thus it escapes. Bfw>ii >if lin| hittr. Ain't the Judge playing the cuttlefish? ">: ^.. .j...- ^nr^ Now I would ask very special attention to the consideration of Judge Douglas' speech at Jacksonville; and when you shall read his speech of to day, I ask you to v/ atoh closely and see which of these pieces of testimony, every one of which he says is a forgery, he has shown to be such. A'ot one of them has he shown to be a forgery. Then I ask the original question, if each of the pieces of testimony is true, how is it possible that the whole is a falsehood? i^ituA. andrffimt- 4UUI^f^0^UAd)fi. I In regard to Trumbull's charge that he (Douglas) inserted a provision into the bill to prevent the Constitution being submitted to the people, what was his answer? He comes here and reads from the Congressional Globe to show that on his motion that provision was struck out of the bill. Why, Trumbull has not said it was not stricken out, but Trumbull says he (Douglas), put it in, and it is no answer to the charge to say he afterwards took it out. Both

are perhaps ' true. It was in regard to that thing precisely that I told him he had dropped the cub. {iRgitiic -ot-*iWhi#. Trumbull shows you that by his introducing the bill it was his cub. UdMiUM. It is no answer to that assertion to call Trum- bull a Uar merely because he did not specially say Douglas struck it out. Suopose that were the case, does it answer Trumbull? jSoyl I assert that you (pointing to an individual,) are here to-day, and you undertake to prove me a liar by showing that you were in Mattoon yes- terday. feiKitttsB,! I say that you took your hat off your head, and you prove me a liar by putting it on your head. aaMi-#4(MgWr.' That is the whole force of Douglas' argument. ' Now, I want to come back to my original question. Trumbull says that Judge Douglas had a bill with a pro- v'ision iu it for submitting a Constitution to be made to a vote ot the people of Kansas. Does Judge Douglas deny thatfact' iEi*iit:,iiftfe,,a,i' Does he deny that the provision which Trumbull reads was put in that bill? Ui&WW>"I Then Trumbull says he struck it out. Does he dare to deny thct V t**w JgaSifei' He does not, and I have the right to repeat the Qyit9,iw-a.- why, Judge Douglas'took it "'* U<BHSSs!to*ft Bigler has said there was a combination ot certain Senators among whom he did not include Judge Douglas' by which it was agreed that the Kansas bill should have a clause in it not to have the Con- ..Etitution formed under it submitted to a vote of the people. He did not say that Douglas was Among them, but we prove by another source that about the same time Douglas comes into the Senate loith that provision stricken out of the bill Although aigler cannot say they were'all work- ing m concert, yet it looks very much as if the thing was agreed upon and done with a mutual understanding after the conference ; and while i we do not know that it was absolutely so, yet it ; looks so probable that we have a right to ca'U up- on the man who knows the true reason why it' was done, to tell what the true reason was. Ciroat ****' When he wUl not tell what the true rea- son was, he stands iu the attitude of an accused tiieel who has stolen goods in his possession, and when called to account, refuses to tell where he got them. bftaMft8,pplasi Not only is this tne evidence, but when he comes in with"the bill having the protisiou stricken out, he tells us in a fpeechb, not then but since, that these altera- tions and modifications in the bill had been made by HIM, m eonmltatkm with Toombs, the orimna'- tor of the bill. He tells us the same to day He says there were certain modifications made in the bill m committee that he did not vote for I as.c you to remember whUe certain amendments were made which he disapproved of, but which a majority of the committee voted in, he has himself told ua that ia this particular the alter- , ations and modifications were made by him mon .^TmAtaUonwttH Toombs. WBB*tirxtrSw- jjMHR We have his own word that these altera- tions were made lyy him and not by the commit- *"" ^Sfc^^. s^M^^-gwnJy^jtowd." Now I ted. ask what ia the reason Judge Douglas i so chary tfie'reason""i"j" ^u" "5V^,nnastion f What is HOW it was ^^"""" "".'y"" anything aVut he remZ? "Jf. ^^ whom it was made, or that he staTd f " " ""S ""^* "" "" '= ""^r does ne stand playmg upon the meaning of words and rrnih 1,T- ' ' ^^ "" ""aning 01 words. If h c """"S ^ ^ tlle edges of the evidence? olaine/rI"P'^ J^I^*^* ' ""* leaves it unex- Fas u. i" }^f^f ^"Slit to infer that Judge Doug- as u aderstood it was the purpose of his party, in e ngineering that bill through, tomakeaCon- w th Vr/, ""* ""^^^ V^i^szs come into the Union w ith that Constitution, witlwut its bang

[illegible]

ltli:111,,'"';1t1:!\'

\ III III

"^I^S:!!^ / B^'^^mtAS. ^ iJlp LINCOLN '^Yi jmM** DoueLAS' aiuiuia speech. When Senator Pqiiglaa.appeared on. the stau^ he ^wa..ieete(i>wijLh.J^ee tremendous cheers. He- aaid: Ladies and Gentlemen: l'our years ago 1 appear- ed before the people of Knox county for the pur- pose of defending my political action upon the compromise measures of 1850 and the passage of l the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Those o(you before me, who were present then, will remember that I vindicated myself for supporting those two measures by the fact that they rested upon the great fundamental principle that the people of_____ each State and each territory of this Union have ! slave and tree States by voting for the English bill, the right, and ought to be permitted to exercise | But while that bill is made a test in Illinois for the should remark here, that my opposition to the he- oompton constitution did not rest upon the peculiar position taken by Kansas on the subject of slavery. I held then, and hold now, that if the people of Kansas want a slave State, it is their right to make one and be received into the Union under it; if, on tl>e contrary, they want a free State, it is their right to have it, and no man should ever oppose their admission because they ask it under the one or the other. I hold to that great principle of self- government which asserts the right of every people to decide for themselves the nature and character ot the domestic institutions and fundamental law under which they are to live. The eflort has been and is now being made in this State by certain postmasters and other federal office holders, to make a test of faith on the sup- port of the English bill. These men are now mak- mg speeches all over the Stale against me and in favor of Lincoln, either directly or indirectly, be cause I would not sanction a discrimination between the right of regulating their own domestic con cerns in their own way, subject to no other limita- tion or

restriction than that which the Constitution of the United States imposes upon them. I then called upon the people of Illinois to decide whether that principle of self-government was --" -- wrong. If it was, and is right, then the measures of 1850 were right, and, consequently, the Kansas and Nebraska bill, based upon the same principle, must necessarily have been right. (That's not, "" ""^ ""^ The Kansas and Nebraska bill declared, in so many words, that it was the true intent and meaning of the act not to legislate slavery into any State or territory, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. For the last four years I have devoted all my energies, in private and public, to commend that principle to the American people. Whatever else may be said in condemnation or support of my political course, I apprehend | "fflm no honest man will doubt the fidelity which, under all circumstances, I have stood by it. During the last year a question arose in the Congress of the United States whether or not that principle would be violated by the admission of Kansas into the Union under the Lecompton constitution. In my opinion, the attempt to force Kansas in under that constitution was a gross violation of the principle enunciated in the compromise measures of 1850 and Kansas and Nebraska bill of 1854, and therefore I led off in the fight against the Lecompton constitution and conducted it until the effort to carry that constitution through Congress was abandoned. And I can appeal to all men, friends and foes, Democrats and Republicans, Northern men Southern men, that during the whole of that fight I carried the banner of Popular Sovereignty aloft, and never allowed it to trail in the dust, or lowered my flag until victory perched upon our arms. (flhnrr) When the Lecompton constitution was defeated, the question arose in the minds of those who had advocated it what they should next resort to in order to carry out their views. They devised a measure known as the English bill, and granted a general amnesty and political pardon to all men who had fought against the Lecompton constitution, provided they would support that bill. I for one did not choose to accept the pardon or to avail myself of the amnesty granted on that condition. The fact that the supporters of Lecompton were willing to forgive all differences of opinion at that time in the event those who opposed it favored the English bill, was an admission that they did not think that opposition to Lecompton impaired a man's standing in the Democratic party. Now the question arises, what was that English bill which certain men are now attempting to make a test of political orthodoxy in this country. It provided in substance, that the Lecompton constitution should be sent back to the people of Kansas for their adoption or rejection, at an election which was held in August last, and in case they refused admission under it that Kansas should be kept out of the Union until she had 93,420 inhabitants. I was in favor of sending the constitution back in order to enable the people to say whether or not it was their act and deed, and embodied their will; but the other proposition, that if they refused to come into the Union under it, they should be kept out until they had double or treble the population they then had, I never would sanction by my vote. The reason why I could not sanction it is to be found in the fact that by the English bill, if the people of Kansas had only agreed

to become a slaveholding State under the Lecompton constitution, they could have done so with 35,000 people, but if they insisted on being a free State, as they had a right to do, then they were to be punished by being kept out of the Union until they had nearly three times that population. I then said in my place in the Senate, as I now say to you, that whenever Kansas has population enough for a slave State she has population enough for a free State. (I told you that.) I have never yet given a vote, and I never intend to record one making an odious and unjust distinction between the different States of this Union. I hold it to be a fundamental principle of our republican form of government that all the States of this Union, old and new, free and slave, stand on an exact equality. Equality among the different States is a cardinal principle on which all our institutions rest. Wherever, therefore, you make a discrimination saying to a slave State that it shall be admitted with 85,000 inhabitants, and to a free State that it shall not be admitted until it has 93,000 or 100,000 inhabitants, you are throwing the whole weight of the federal government into the scale in favor of one class of States against the other. Nor would I on the other hand any sooner concede that a free State could be admitted into the Union with 35,000 people, while a slave State was kept out until it had 93,000. I have always declared in the Senate my willingness, and I am willing now to adopt the rule, that no territory shall ever become a State until it has the requisite population for a member of Congress, according to the then existing ratio. But while I have always been, and am now willing to adopt that general rule, I was not willing and would not consent to make an exception of Kansas, as a punishment for her obstinacy, in demanding the right to do as she pleased in the formation of her constitution. It is proper that I purpose of breaking up the Democratic organization in this State, how is it in the other States? Go to Indiana, and there you find English himself, the author of the English bill, who is a candidate for re-election to Congress, has been forced by public opinion to abandon his own darling project, and the consequence; to give a promise that he will vote for the admission of Kansas at once, whenever she forms a constitution in pursuance of law, and ratifies it by a majority vote of her people. Not only is this the case with English himself, but I am informed that every Democratic candidate for Congress in Indiana takes the same ground. Pass to Ohio, and there you find that Croesbeek, and Pennington, and Cox, and all the other anti-Lecompton men who stood shoulder to shoulder with me against the Lecompton constitution, but voted for the English bill, now repudiate it and take the same ground that I do on that question. So it is with the Joneses and others of Pennsylvania, and so it is with every other Lecompton Democrat in the free States. They now abandon even the English bill, and come back to the true platform which I proclaimed at the time in the Senate, and upon which the Democracy of Illinois now stand. And yet, notwithstanding the fact, that every Lecompton and anti-Lecompton Democrat in the free States has abandoned the English bill, you are told that it is to be made a test upon me, while the power and patronage of the government are all exerted to elect men to Congress in the other States who occupy the same position with reference to it that I do. It seems that my political offence consists in the fact that I first did not vote for the English bill, and

thus pledge myself to keep Kansas out of the Union until she has a population of 98,420, and then return home, violate that pledge, repudiate the bill, and take the opposite ground. If I had done this, perhaps the administration would now be advocating my re-election, as it is that of the others who have pursued this course. I did not choose to give that pledge, for the reason that I did not intend to carry out that principle. I never will consent, for the sake of conciliating the frowns of power, to pledge myself to do that which I do not intend to perform. I now submit the question to you as my constituency, whether I was not right, first, in resisting the adoption of the Lecompton constitution; and secondly, in resisting the English bill. (Afl-Bivei-'-es," lifeaim.tihft-ffrnwdi) I repeat, that I opposed the Lecompton constitution because it was not the act and deed of the people of Kansas, and did not embody their will. I denied the right of any power on earth under our system of government to force a constitution on an unwilling people. ^tf>iM .toar. te&i)l!'jflfite)AS.KIU**&^-'i'here was a time when some men could pretend to believe that the Lecompton constitution embodied the will of the people of Kansas, but that time has passed. The question was referred to the people of Kansas under the English bill last August, and then, at a fair election, they rejected the Lecompton constitution by a vote of from eight to ten against it to one in its favor. Since it has been voted down by so overwhelming a majority, no man can pretend that it was the act and deed of that people. (SBbaftme; iiii iiiiHiiii) I submit the question to you whether or not if it had not been for me that constitution would have been crammed down the throats of the people of Kansas against their consent. (ii>wl .jt ,WOuld,...iir*.-Coj-Jiou^la8.j. thi cheers"fe, I,^auglu%jiw) While at least ninety-nine out of every hundred people here present agree that I was right in defeating that project, yet my enemies use the fact that I did defeat it by doing right, to break me down and put another man in the U. S. Senate in my place. (Jilo,.ato,-#att'iil,..to. Xtlinff<i; tj)e&,ctuM%>di.) The very men who acknowledge that I was right in defeating Lecompton, now form an alliance with federal office holders, professed Lecompton men, to defeat me, because I did right. ^it'DiftliABiUliiP ^ ^T political opponent, Mr. Lincoln, has no hope on earth, and has never dreamed that he had a chance of success, were it not for the aid he is receiving from federal office holders, who are using their influence and the patronage of the government against me in revenge for my having defeated the Lecompton constitution. (JtUiia:'^ii,taj..^ad.J4>- .pliiiKii) What do you Republicans think of a political organization that will try to make an unholy and unnatural combination with its professed foes to beat a man merely because he has done right? ("-----1" it) You know such is the fact with regard to your own party. You know that the axe of decapitation is suspended over every man in office in Illinois, and the terrors of proscription is threatened every Democrat by the present administration unless he supports the Republican ticket in preference to my Democratic associates and myself. (3)liiOii | wi' 4teAce.wiih,yuu.- Let them threaten,-&e.) I could find an instance in the postmaster of the city of Galesburg, and in every other postmaster in this vicinity, all of whom have been stricken down simply because they discharged the duties of their offices honestly, and supported the regular Democratic ticket in this State in the right. The Republican party is availing itself of every unworthy means

in | the present contest to carry the election, because its leaders know that if they let this chance slip they will never have another, and their hopes of making this a Republican State will be blasted forever. Now, let me ask you whether the country has any interest in sustaining this organization known as the Republican party? That party is unlike all other political organizations in this country. All % !; MI fHiiiiii^'

*^;jfes -" 1 | | |

fl i ' l' l - ! ^W 1 : ; other parties have been national in their character ' have avowed their principles alike in the slave and the free States, in Kentucky as well as in Illinois, in Louisiana as well as in Massachusetts. Such was the case with the old Whig party, and such was and is the case with the Democratic party. Whigs and Democrats could proclaim their principles boldly and fearlessly in the north and in the south, in the east and in the west, wherever the constitution ruled and the American flag waved over American soil. y- But now you have a sectional organization. a party ' which appeals to the northern section of the Union against the southern, a party which appeals to northern passion, northern pride, northern ambition, and northern prejudices, against southern people, the southern States and southern institutions, the leaders of that party hope that they will be able to unite the northern States in one great sectional party, and inasmuch as the North is the strongest section, that they will thus be enabled to out vote, conquer, govern, and control the South. Hence you find that they now make speeches advocating principles and measures which cannot be defended in any slaveholding State of this Union. Is there a Republican residing in (ilesburg who can travel into Kentucky and carry his principles with him across the Ohio? Iglm.) What Republican from Massachusetts can visit the Old Dominion without leaving his principles behind him when he crosses Mason and Dixon's line ? Permit me to say to you in perfect good humor, but in all sincerity, that no political creed is sound which cannot be proclaimed fearlessly in every State of this Union where the Federal Constitution is not the supreme law is this Republican party unable to proclaim its principles alike in the North and in the South, in the free States and in the slave States, but it cannot even proclaim them in the same forms and give them the same strength and meaning in all parts of the same State. My friend Lincoln finds it extremely difficult to manage a debate in the centre part of the State, where there is a mixture of men from the North and the South. In the extreme northern part of Illinois he can proclaim as bold and radical abolitionism as ever Oiddings, Lovejoy, or Gerrisou enunciated, but when he gets down a little further South he claims that he is an old line Whig, (gaBr;J,{iil | | | i>i ,) disciple of Henry Clay, >" Sincli'^"" ""?' tia.ri(if'riittidi<ilfiy!iiii nntninnntiinn for oecTares that he still adheres to the old line Whig pret-d, and has nothing whatever to do with Abolitionism, or negro equality, or negro citizenship. ("lhii l iiti'tnr T^nnflJun ") I once before hinted this of Mr. Lincoln in a public speech, and at Charleston he defied me to show That there was any difference between his speeches in the North and in the South, and that they were not in strict

harmony. I will now call your attention to two of them, and you can then say whether you would be apt to believe that the same man ever uttered both. (^MmUat st^^^^saa^^) In a speech in reply to me at Chicago in July last, Mr. Lincoln, in speaking of the equality of the negro with the white man used the following language: 'I should like to know. In taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If the man says it does not reach a negro, why may not another man say it does not mean another man? (Lincoln.) If the Declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book in which we find it and tear it out. Who is so bold as to do it? If it is not true, let us tear it out.' You find that Mr. Lincoln there proposed that if the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, declaring all men to be born equal, did not include the negro and put him on an equality with the white man, that we should take the statute book and tear it out. (Lincoln.) He there took the ground that the negro race is included in the Declaration of Independence as the equal of the white race, and that there could be no such thing as a distinction in the races, making one superior and the other inferior. I read now from the same speech: "My friends, he says, I have detained you about as long as I desire to do, and I have only to say let us discard all this rubbish about this man and the other man this race and that race, and the other race being inferior and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position, discarding our standard that we have left us. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up declaring that all men are created equal." ("^Etek* figW, &o.) Yea, I have no doubt that you think it is right, but the Lincoln men down in Coles, Tazewell and Sangamon counties do not think it is right, in the conclusion of the same speech, talking to the Chicago Abolitionists, he said: "I leave you, hoping that the lamp of liberty will burn in your bosoms until there shall no longer be a doubt that all men are created free and equal." (Lincoln, 8th July, 1858. ^ Well, you say good to that, and you are going to vote for Lincoln because he holds that doctrine. ^^^^^ blame you for supporting him on that ground, but I will show you in immediate contact with that doctrine, what Mr. Lincoln said down in Egypt in order to get votes in that locality where they do not hold to such a doctrine. In a joint discussion between Mr. Lincoln and myself at Charleston, I think, on the 18th of last month, Mr. Lincoln referring to this subject used the following language: I will say then, that I am not nor never have been in favor of bringing about in any way, the social and political equality of the white and black races: that I am not nor have been in favor of making voters of the free negroes jurors, or qualifying them to hold office, or having them to marry with white people. I will say in addition, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which, I suppose, will forever forbid the two races to meet upon terms of social and political equality, so that they cannot so live, that while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior that I as much as any other man am in favor of the superior position being assigned to the white man." (Lincoln.) Fellow-citizens, here you find men hurrying for Lincoln and saying that he did right, when in one part of the State he stood up for negro equality, and in

another part for political effect, discarded the doctrine and declared that there always must be a superior and inferior race. (Xiii#Mrt. !> btoiiii *t ikem^ut,--**.) Abolitionists up north are expected to be required to vote for Lincoln because he goes for the equality of the races, holding that by the Declaration of Independence the white man and the old Whigs, the Kentuckians, Virginians, and Tennesseeans, that there is a physical difference in the races, making one superior and the other inferior and that he is in favor of maintaining the superiority of the white race over the negro. Now, how can you reconcile those two positions of Mr. Lincoln. He is to be voted for in the south as a pro-slavery man, and he is to be voted for in the north as an Abolitionist. ("T.m. it tolinwi'n vHit 'Lrfuj.l'kl. ") Up here he thinks it is all nonsense to talk about a difference between the races, and "a whole world's equality, and down south he tells the slaves that we must "discard all quibbling about this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position." Down south he makes this "quibble" about this race and that race and the other race being inferior as the creed of his party, and declares that the negro can never be elevated to the position of the white man. You find that his political meetings are called by different names in different counties in the State. Here they are called Republican meetings, but in old Tazewell, where Lincoln made a speech last Tuesday, he did not address a Sepulchral meeting, but "a grand rally of the Lincoln men." (Lililili liiii!l,ltw.) There are very few Republicans there, because Tazewell county is filled with old Virginians and Kentuckians, all of whom are Whigs or Democrats, and if Mr. Lincoln had called an Abolition or Republican meeting there, he would not get many votes. fJBInJgpr.; Go down into Egypt and you find that he and his party are operating under an alias there, which his friend Trumbull has given them, in order that they may cheat the people. When I was down in Monroe county a few weeks ago addressing the people, I saw handbills posted announcing that Mr. Trumbull was going to speak in behalf of Lincoln, and what do you think the name of his party was there? Why the Free Democracy. (iMmMimMK-) Mr. Lincoln and , Mr. John Baker were announced to address the Free Democracy of Monroe county, and the bill was signed "Many Free Democrats." The reason that Lincoln and his party adopted the name of "Free Democracy" down there was because Monroe county has always been an old fashioned Democratic county, and hence it was necessary to make the people believe that they were Democrats, sympathized with them, and were fighting for Lincoln as Democrats. aBart-*!r*c) Come up to Springfield, where Lincoln now lives and always has lived, and you find that the convention of his party which assembled to nominate candidates for legislature, who are expected to vote for him if elected, dare not adopt the name of Republican, but assembled under the title of "all opposed to the Democracy." V n'^yuHlitliirifr'''''' " I^us you find that Mr. Lincoln's creed cannot travel through even one half of the counties of this State, but that it changes its hues and becomes lighter and lighter, as it travels from the extreme North, until it is nearly white, when it reaches the extreme south end of the State. Q!teiep.-iti8iPM*,ej.) I ask you, my friends, why cannot Republicans avow their principles alike everywhere y I would despise myself if I thought that "I was procuring your votes by concealing

my opinions, and by avowing one set of principles in one part of the State, and a different set in another part. If I do not truly and honorably represent your feelings and principles, then I ought not to be your Senator; and I will never conceal my opinions, or modify or change them a hair's breadth in order to get votes. I tell you that this Chicago doctrine of Lincoln's declaring that the negro and the white man are made equal by the Declaration of Independence and by Divine Providence is a monstrous heresy. (It) is a monstrous heresy. The signers of 'the Declaration of Independence never dreamed of the negro when they were writing that document. They referred to white men, to men of European birth and European descent, I when they declared the equality of all men. I see a gentleman there in the crowd shaking his head. Let me remind him that when Thomas Jefferson wrote that document he was the owner, and so continued until his death, of a large number of slaves. Did he intend to say in that Declaration that his negro slaves, which he held and treated as property, were created his equals by Divine law, and that he was violating the law of God every day of his life by holding them as slaves? (It) must be borne in mind that when that Declaration was put forth every one of the thirteen colonies were slaveholding colonies, and every man who signed that instrument represented a slaveholding constituency. Recollect, also, that no one of them emancipated his slaves, much less put them on an equality with himself, after he signed the Declaration. On the contrary, they all continued to hold their negroes as slaves during the revolutionary war. Now, do you believe are you willing to have it said that every man who signed the Declaration of Independence declared the negro his equal, and then was hypocrite enough to continue to hold him as a slave, in violation of what he believed to be the divine law. And yet when you say that the Declaration of Independence includes the negro, you charge the signers of it with hypocrisy. I say to you, frankly, that in my opinion this government was made by our fathers on the white basis. It was made by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and was intended to be administered by white men in all time to come. But while I hold that under our temperate and political system the negro is not a citizen, cannot be a citizen, and ought not to be a citizen, it does not follow by any means that he should be a slave. On the contrary it does follow that the negro, as an inferior race, ought to possess every right, every privilege, every immunity which he can safely exercise consistent with the safety of the society in which he lives. Humanity requires, and Christianity commands that you shall extend to every inferior being, and every dependent being, all the privileges, immunities and advantages which can be granted to them consistent with the safety of society. If you ask me the nature and extent of these privileges, I answer that that is a question which the people of each State must decide for themselves. Illinois has decided that question for herself. We have said that in this State the negro shall not be a slave, nor shall he be a citizen. Kentucky holds a different doctrine. New York holds one different doctrine.

y^k^itife

i\\

""-!*-^y.>>: from either, and Waione aiii uL iroi ail, Vir- ginia, iu her policy on this question, differs in many respects from the otheis, and so on, until there is hardly two States whose polici s exactly alike in regard to the relation of the white man and the ne- gro. Nor can you reconcile them and make them alike. Bach State must do as it pleases. Illinois had as much right to adopt the policy which we have on that subjeci as Kentucky had to adopt a diiii'erent policy. The great principle of this gov ernment is that each State has the right to do as it pleases on all these questions, and no other State, or power on earth has the right to interfere with us, or complain of us merely because our system dif- fers from theirs. In the compromise measures of 1850, Mr. Clay declared that this great principle ought to exist in the territories as well as iu the States, and I reasserted his doctrine in the Kansas and Nebraska bill in 1854. „-But Mr. liincoln cannot be made to understand, and those who are determined to vote for him, no matter whether he is a pro-slavery man in the south and a negro equality advocate in the north, cannot be made to understand how it is that in a territory the peoole can do as they please on the slavery question under the l)red Scott decision. Let us see whether I cauut explain it to the satisfaction of all impartial men. Chief Justice Taney has said m his opinion in the Dred Scott case, that a negro slave being property, stands on an equal footing with other property, and that the owner may carry them into United States territory the same as he does other property. (Wtatfu ao.) Suppose any two of you, neighbors, should conclude to go to Kansas, one carrying \$100,000 worth of negro slaves and the other \$100,000 worth of mixed merchandise, in- cluding quantities of liquors. You both agree that under that decision you may carry your property to Kansas, but when you get it there, the merchant who is possessed of the liquors is met by the Maine liquor law, which prohibits the sale or use of his property, and the owner of the slaves is met by equally unfriendly legislation^ which makes his pro- perty worthless after he gets it there. VV hat is the right to carry your property into the lerritory worth to either, when unfriendly legislation in the territory renders it worthless after you get it there? The slaveholder when he gets his slaves there finds that there is no local law to protect him in holding them, no slave code, no police regala- tion maintain- ing and supporting him in his right, and he discov- ers at once that the abse ce of such friendly legislation excludes his property from the territory, just as irresistibly as if there was a positive con- stitutional prohibition excluding it. Thus you find it is with any kind of property in a territory, it depends for its protection on the local and munici- pal law. If the people of a territory want slavery, they make friendly legislation to introduce it, but if they do not want it, they withhold all protection from it, and then it cannot exist there. Such was the view taken on the S'lbject

by different Southern men when the Nebraska bill passed. See the speech of Mr. Orr, of South Carolina, the present Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress made at that time, and there you will find this whole doctrine argued out at full length. Read the speeches of other southern congressmen, Senators and Representatives, made in 1854, and you will find that they took the same view of the subject as Mr. Orr that slavery could never be forced on a people who did not want it. I hold that in this country there is no power on the face of the globe that can force any institution on an unwilling people. The great fundamental principle of our government is, that the people of each State and each territory shall be left perfectly free to decide for themselves what shall be the nature and character of their institutions. When this government was made, it was based on that principle. At the time of its formation there were twelve slaveholding States and one free State in this Union. Suppose this doctrine of Mr. Lincoln and the Republicans, of uniformity of the laws of all the States on the subject of slavery, had prevailed; suppose Mr. Lincoln himself had been a member of the convention which framed the constitution, and that he had risen in that august body, and addressing the father of his country, had said as he did at Springfield; "A house divided against itself cannot stand. - I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved. I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other." What do you think would have been the result? (iiBaaitab^Ba'gIM'-) Suppose he had made that convention believe that doctrine and they had acted upon it, what do you think would have been the result? Do you believe that the one free State would have outvoted the twelve slaveholding States, and thus abolished slavery? ^Jtol woJ-dct>M>.) On the contrary, would not the twelve slaveholding States have outvoted the one free State, and under his doctrine have fastened slavery by an irrevocable constitutional provision upon every inch of the American Republic. Thus you see that the doctrine he now advocates, if proclaimed at the beginning of the government, would have established slavery everywhere throughout the American continent, and are you willing, now that we have the majority section, to exercise a power which we never would have submitted to when we were in the minority? 4Si:Si3pR^"fn<*,ijaat.appile.) If the Southern States had attempted to control our institutions, and make the States all slave when they had the power, I ask would you have submitted to it? If you would not, are you willing now that we have become the strongest under that great principle of self government that allows each State to do as it pleases to attempt to control the Southern institutions? C*IM| |HV) Then, my friends, I say to you that there is but one path of peace in this republic, and that is to administer this government as our fathers made it, divided into free and slave States, allowing each State to decide for itself whether it wants slavery or not. If Illinois will settle the slavery question for herself, mind her own business and let her neighbors alone, we will be at peace with Kentucky, and every other Southern State. If every other State in the Union will do the same there will be peace between the North and the South, and in the whole Union. I am told that my time has expired. (Nine cheers for Douglas.) Mr. Nicolli's Reply. 'Ml. Linspln was rtjctjired as he came forward Witb. .tblfifi enthusiastic

cheers, coming from every part of the vast assembly. After silence was restored, Mr. Lincoln said: Mr. Fellow Citizens A very large portion of the speech which Judge Douglas has addressed to you has previously been delivered and put in print. I do not mean that for a hit upon the Judge at all. If I had not been interrupted, I was going to say that such an answer as I was able to make to a very large portion of it, had already been more than once made and published. There has been an opportunity afforded to the public to see our respective views upon the topics discussed in a large portion of the speech which he has just delivered. I make these remarks for the purpose of excusing myself for not passing over the entire ground that the Judge has traversed. I however desire to take up some of the points that he has attended to, and ask your attention to them, and I shall follow him backwards upon some notes which I have taken, reversing the order by beginning where he concluded. The Judge has alluded to the Declaration of Independence, and insisted that negroes are not included in that Declaration; and that it is a slander upon the framers of that instrument, to suppose that negroes were meant therein; And he asks you; Is it possible to believe that Mr. Jefferson, who penned the immortal paper, could have supposed himself applying the language of that instrument to the negro race, and yet held a portion of that race in slavery? I only have to remark upon this part of the Judge's speech, (and that, too, very briefly, for I shall not detain myself, or you, upon that point for any great length of time,) that I believe the entire records of the world, from the date of the Declaration of Independence up to within three years ago, may be searched in vain for one single affirmation, from one single man, that the negro was not included in the Declaration of Independence. I think I may defy Judge Douglas to show that he ever said so, that Washington ever said so, that any President ever said so, that any member of Congress ever said so, or that any living man upon the whole earth ever said so, until the necessities of the present policy of the Democratic party, in regard to slavery, had to invent that affirmation. Because. And I will remind Judge Douglas and this audience, that while Mr. Jefferson was the owner of slaves, as undoubtedly he was, in speaking upon this very subject, he used the strong language that "he trembled for his country when he remembered that God was just;" and I will offer the highest premium in my power to Judge Douglas if he will show that he, in all his life, ever uttered a sentiment at all akin to that of Jefferson, finally. The next thing to which I will ask your attention is the Judge's comments upon the fact, as he assumes it; to be, that we cannot call our public meetings as Eepublican meetings; and he instances Tazewell county as one of the places where the friends of Lincoln have called a public meeting and have not dared to name it a Republican meeting. He instances Monroe county as another where Judge Trumbull and Jehu Baker addressed the persons whom the Judge assumes to be the friends of Lincoln, calling them the "Free Democracy." I have the honor to inform Judge Douglas that he spoke in that very county of Tazewell last Saturday, and I was there, on Tuesday last, and when he spoke there he spoke under a call not venturing to use the word "Democrat." (Turning to Judge Douglas.) What do you think of

this ? EtBMmMi8a>ap;plita8a..d So again, there is another thing to which I would ask the Judge's attention upon this subject. In the contest of 1856 his party delighted to call themselves together as the "National Democracy," but now, if there should be a notice put up anywhere for a meeting of the "National Democracy," Judge Douglas and his friends would not come. They would not suppose themselves invited. RnnnaKiiil Itni^twKaffiaBhMia. They would understand that it was a call for those hateful Postmasters whom he talks about, Ilpiaai^iecw liwishtan Now a few words in regard to these extracts from speeches of mine, which Judge Douglas has read to you, and which he supposes are in very great contrast to each other. Those speeches have been before the public for a considerable time, and if they have any inconsistency in them, if there is any conflict in them the public have been able to detect it. When the Judge says, in speaking on this subject, that I make speeches of one sort for the people of the Northern end of the State, and of a different sort for the Southern people, he assumes that I do not understand that my speeches will be put in print and read North and South. I knew all the while that the speech that I made at Chicago and the one I made at Jonesboro and the one at Charleston, would all be put in print and all the reading and intelligent men in the community would see them and know all about my opinions. And I have not supposed, and do not now suppose, that there is any conflict whatever between them. ftMEfaejcrareaill gflq.d.aaftexib'asri-l.Jlurrati.fatJiine&ln !" But the Judge will have it that if we do not confess that there is a sort of inequality between the white and black races, which justifies us in making them slaves, we must, then, insist that there is a degree of equality that requires us to make them our wives. . |ii4Apjil^u3e, d rics, "-Give it to him;" ^Hit him again." Now, I have all the while taken a broad distinction in regard to that matter; and that is all there is in these different speeches which he arrays here, and the entire reading of either of the speeches will show that that distinction was made. Perhaps by taking two parts of the same speech, he could have got up as much of a conflict as the one he has found. I have all the while maintained, that so far as it should be insisted that there was an equality between the

^e^ . l r l 9 l

;X maintained, so far as I was able, that there was white and black: races that should produce a perfect social and political equality, it was an ! fj '=<>"P;o'ise of 1800 at all-nothing what-ibility. This you have seen in my print-nliL^J^ I ?i 1^ . "" *^^ principle of the ehcs, and with it I have said, that in i Nebraska bill that compromise V If any-ht.,' life, liberty and the pursuit of """"?' "" *^ ^T "Ph^""-^ "" the compromise or- ---.'- ----!' - . . ; .. , "" - gamzing the Territories of New Mexico and Utah. It was expressly provided in these two acts, that, when they came to be admitted into the Union, they should be admitted with or without slavery, as they should choose, by their own constitutions. Nothing was said in either of those acts as to what was to be done in relation to slavery during the territorial existence of those territories, while Henry Clay

constantly made the declaration, (Judge Douglas recogni- zing him as a leader) that, in his opinion, the old Mexican laws would control that question during the territorial existence, and that these old Mexican laws excluded slavery. How can that be used as a principle for declaring that during the territorial existence as well as at the time of framing the constiUition, the people, if you please, might have slaves if they wanted I^them? I am not discussing the question whe- ther it is right or wrong; but how are the New Mexican and Utah laws patterns for the Nebras- Ita bill ? I maintain that the organization of Utah and New Mexico did not establish a gene- ral principle at all. It had no feature of estab- lishing a general principle. The acts to which I have referred were a part of a general system t Compromises. They did not lay down what was proposed as a regular policy for the Terri- tories; only an agreement in this particular case to do in that way, because other things were done that were to be a compensation for it. They impossi ea speet^.,, thtiEjight to happiness," as profeialmed in fhat old Heclara' tion, the inferior races are our equals. Xi(si#- .u>twu4-ebiB)i(. And these declarations I have constantly made in reference to tho ab- stract moral question, to contemplate and con- sider when we are legislating about any new country which is not already cursed with the actual piesencp of the evil slavery. 1 have never manifested any iiiipat'iennee with the ne- cessities that spring from the actual presence of black people amongst us, and the actual exist- ence of slavery amongst us where it does al- ready exist; but I have insisted that, in legis- lating for new countries, where it does not ex- ist, there ia no just rule other than that of moral and abstract right I With reference to those new countries, those maxims as to the right of a people to "life, liberty and the pur- suit of happiness," were the just rules to be con- stantly referred to. There is rib misunderstanding tills, except by men interested to misuiidersta-nd it. Aninl wij 1 take it that I have to address an intelligent and reading community, who will pc- luse what I say, weigh it, and then judge whether I advance improper or inisoniid views, or whether 1 advance byppiiriti;-:!.!, iind (lo(le itivc, and con- trary views in diffei-ei.j. puitious of the country. 1 believe myself to be guilty of no such thing as 'the latter, thongh, qfcouiw,!. cannot claim that ' I am entii'eiy frcB from aU eVfPr ifi the opinions I advance. The kludge has also detained ns a while in re- paid to the distinction between his party and onr paiiy. His he assumes to be a national party ouii, a sectional one. He does this in asking the question whether this country has any interest in the maintenance of the Bepublioan party 1 He assumes that our party iA'altogethef sectional (hat the party to wli)cn he adhej-es is national; and the arguinent is, tiiat no parfc,y can be a right- , M party can be based upon rightful principles unless it can annoaSCS 1':". "rincinles every- where. I presume that Judge bouglas could not go into Eugisia and announce the doctrine of our national aeniooracy; lie could nut denounce the doctrine of kings, and emperors, and monarchies, in Eiissia; and it may be true of this country, i that in some places we may not be able to pro- I claim a doctrine as clearly true as the truth of ' democracy, because there is a section so directly opposed to it that they will not tolerate us in doing so. Is It the true test of the soundness of a ilOf.tri\le, that in some places people won't let yous pi'oclaim it ? | fil()^JinT Is that the way to' tost the truth of any doctrine ? U<f>9f.. Why, I understood

that at one time the people of Chicago would not let Judge Douglas preach a certain favorite doctrine of his. I commend to his consideration the question, whether he takes that as a test of the unsoundness of what he wanted to preach. There is another thing to which I wish to ask attention for a little while on this occasion. What has always been the evidence brought forward to prove that the Republican party is a sectional party? The main one was that in the southern portion of the Union the people did not let the Republicans proclaim their doctrine amongst them. That has been the main evidence brought forward that they had no supporters, or substantially none, in the Slave States. The South have not taken hold of our principles as we announce them; nor does Judge Douglas now grapple with those principles. We have a Republican State Platform, laid down in Springfield last, stating our position all the way through the questions before the country. We are now far advanced in this canvass. Judge Douglas and I have made perhaps forty speeches apiece, and we have now for the fifth time met face to face in debate, and up to this day have not found either Judge Douglas or any friend of his taking hold of the Republican platform or laying his finger upon anything in it that is wrong. I ask you all to recollect that. Judge Douglas turns away from the platform of principles to the fact that he can find people somewhere who will not allow us to announce those principles. If he had great confidence that our principles were wrong, he would take hold of them and demonstrate them to be wrong. But he does not do so. The only evidence he has of their being wrong is the fact that there are people who won't allow us to preach them. I ask again, is that the way to test the soundness of a doctrine? "No," I would say. I ask his attention also to the fact that by the rule of nationality he is himself fast becoming sectional. I ask his attention to the fact that his speeches would not go as current now south of the Ohio River as they have formerly gone there. I ask his attention to the fact that he congratulates himself to-day that all the Democrats of the Free States are agreeing with him, while he omits to tell us that the Democrats of any Slave State agree with him. If he has not thought of this, I commend to his consideration the evidence in his own declaration, on this day, of his becoming sectional too. I see it rapidly approaching. Whatever may be the result of this ephemeral contest between Judge Douglas and myself, I see the day rapidly approaching when his pill of sectionalism, which he has been thrusting down the throats of Republicans for years past, will be crowded down his own throat. Now in regard to what Judge Douglas said (in the beginning of his speech) about the Compromise of 1850, containing the principle of the Nebraska bill, although I have often presented my views upon that subject, yet as I have not done so in this canvass, I will, if you please, detain you a little with them. I was always allowed to come in in that shape, because in another way it was paid for considering that as a part of that system of measures called the Compromise of 1850, which finally included half a dozen acts. It included the admission of California as a free State, which was kept out of the Union for half a year because it had formed a free Constitution. It included the settlement of the boundary of Texas, which had been undefined before, which was

in itself a slavery question ; for, if you pushed the line; farther west, you made Texas larger, and made more slave territory; while, if you drew the line towards the east, you narrowed the boundary and diminished the domain of slavery, and by so much increased free territory. It included the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia. It included the passage of a new Fugitive Slave Law. All these things were put together, and though passed in separate acts, were nevertheless in legislation, (as the speeches at the time will show), made to depend upon each other. Each got votes, with the understanding that the other measures were to pass, and by this system of compromise, in that series of measures, those two bills the New Mexico and Utah bills were passed; and I say for that reason they could not be taken as models, framed upon their own intrinsic principle, for all future Territories. And have the evidence of this in the fact that Judge Douglas, a year afterwards, or more than a year afterwards, perhaps, when he first introduced bills for the purpose of framing new Territories, did not attempt to follow these bills of New* Mexico and Utah; and even when he introduced this Nebraska bill, I think you will discover that he did not exactly follow them. But I do not wish to dwell at great length upon this branch of the discussion. My opinion is, that a thorough investigation will show most plainly that the New Mexico and Utah bills were part of a system of compromise, and not designed as patterns for future territorial legislation; and that this Nebraska bill did not follow them as a pattern at all. The Judge tells, in proceeding, that he is opposed to making any odious distinctions between Free and Slave States. I am altogether unaware that the Republicans are in favor of making any odious distinctions between the Free and Slave States. But there still is a difference, I think, between Judge Douglas and the Republicans in this. I suppose that the real difference between Judge Douglas and his friends, and the Republicans on the contrary, is that the Judge is not in favor of making any difference between Slavery and Liberty that he is in favor of eradicating, of pressing out of view, the questions of preference in this country for Free over Slave institutions ; and consequently every sentiment he utters discards the idea that there is any wrong in Slavery. Everything that emanates from him or his coadjutors in their course of policy, carefully excludes the thought that there is anything wrong in Slavery. All their arguments, if you will consider them, will be seen to exclude the thought that there is anything whatever wrong in Slavery. ' If you will take the Judge's speeches, and select the short and pointed sentences expressed by him as his declaration that he " don't care whether Slavery is voted up "or down" you will see at once that this is perfectly logical, if you do not ! admit that Slavery is wrong. If you do admit that it is wrong. Judge Douglas cannot logically say that he don't care whether a wrong is voted up or voted down. Judge Douglas declares that if any community want Slavery they have a right to have it. He can say that logically, if he says ;that there is no wrong in Slavery ; but if you admit. that there is a wrong in it, he cannot logically say that anybody has a right to do wrong. He insists that, upon the score of equality, the owners of . slaves and owners of property of horses and every other sort of property should be alike and hold them alike in a new Territory. That is perfectly logical, if the two species of property are alike and are equally founded in right. But if you admit that one of

them is wrong, you cannot institute any equality between right and wrong. And from this difference of sentiment the belief on the part of one that the institution is wrong, and a policy springing from that belief which looks to the arrest of the enlargement of that wrong; and this other sentiment, that it is no wrong, and a policy sprung from that sentiment which will tolerate no idea of preventing that wrong. /> !1

H ^j^lgij^lvA,'

(0^- ^as^- il l /;<

/

^!i^- ! from growing larger, Bnd looks to there never being an end of it through all the existence of things, arises the real difference between Judge Douglas and his friends, on the one hand, and the Republicans on the other. Now, I confess myself as belonging to that class in the country who contemplate slavery as a moral, social and political evil, having due regard for its actual existence amongst us and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way, and to all the constitutional obligations which have been thrown about it; but, nevertheless, desire a policy that looks to the prevention of it as a wrong, and looks hopefully to the time when as a wrong it may come to an end. ^ / Judge Douglas has again, for, I believe, the ^, 'fifth time, if not the seventh, in my presence, -^ / reiterated his charge of a conspiracy or combination between the National Democrats and Ipepublicans. What evidence Judge Douglas has upon this subject I know not, inasmuch as he never favors it with any. iimght and ..ito.OT 1 have said upon a former occasion, and I do not choose to suppress it now, that I have no objection to the division in the Judge's party. J^jjewsl lie got it up himself. It was / all his an?"t!eir work. He bad, I think, a " great deal more to do with the steps that led to the liecompton Constitution than Mr. Buchanan had ^pjioe I; lhcigh at last, _ when they reached it, they quarrelled over it, and their friends divided upon it. f.ASiilM'*-1 ^ "m ', ' very free to confess to Judge Douglas that I have no objection to the division, -lou4~ftp. pkliiinrl limrtitrrr ; but I defy the Judge^to show any evidence that I have in any way promoted that division, unless he insists on being a witness himself in merely saying so. li^ffilf^lkt * . 1 can give all fair friends of judge Doug- ", las here to understand exactly the view that Republicans take in regard to that division. Don't you remember how two ygars ago th^ opponents of the jjeipofratio party were divided between Fremont and PiUmore ? I guess you do. "as^siF>-wei-reieBber iimighty well." Any Democrat who remembers that division, will remember also that he was at the time "Cy glad of it, p^i^(btoi, and then he will be able to see all there is between the Ki^tial Demo- crats and the liepublicahs. What^w^ now think of the tvfo" divisions of Jjetiiocrats, you then thought of the i'remo^t and yiUmore divisions. hHaa^inhflftlM- 1^hat is all there is of it. Dut, if the Judge continues to put forward the declaration that there is an unholy and unnatural alliance between

the Republican and the National Democrats, I now want to enter my protest against receiving him as an entirely competent witness upon that subject, ffcaad. h8M . I want to call to the Judge's attention an attack he made upon me in the first one of these debates, at Ottawa, on the 21st of August. In order to fix extreme Abolitionism upon me. Judge Douglas read a set of resolutions which he declared had been passed by a Republican State Convention, in Oct., 1864, at Springfield, Illinois, and he declared I had taken part in that Convention. It turned out that although a few men calling themselves an Anti-Nebraska State Convention had sat at Springfield about that time, yet neither did I take any part in it, nor did it pass the resolutions or any such resolutions as Judge Douglas read. Great applause! So apparent had it become that the resolutions which he read had not been passed at Springfield at all, nor by a State Convention in which I had taken part, that seven days afterwards, at Freeport, Judge Douglas declared that he had been misled by Charles H. Laapbier, editor of the *Herald Register*, and Thomas L. Harris member of Congress in that District, and he promised in that speech that when he went to Springfield he would investigate the matter. Since then Judge Douglas has been to Springfield, and I presume has made the investigation ; but a month has passed since he has been there, and so far as I know, he has made no report of the result of his investigation. (itSS^^^ filmSel. I have waited as I think sufficient time for the report of that investigation, and I have some curiosity to see and hear it. A#- alaise. A fraud and absolute forgery was committed, and the perpetration of it was traced to the three Lanhier, Harris and Douglas. ^,p0aBa*j,dBUJWtte-- Whether it can be narrowed in any way so as to exonerate any one of them, is what Judge Douglas' report would probably show. A,pptaaattdaitWw. It is true that the set of resolutions read by Judge Douglas were published in the *Illinois State BegwUro-nihe* 16th Oct., 1864, as being the resolutions of an Anti-Nebraska Convention, which had sat in that same month of October at Springfield. But it is also true that the publication in the *Register* was a forgery then *re-h* and the question is still behind, which of them, if not all of them, committed that forgery ? sei-f*I*B* The idea that it was done by mistake, is absurd. The article in the *Illinois State Register* contains part of the real proceedings of that Springfield Convention, showing that the writer of the article had the real proceedings before him, and purposely threw out the genuine resolutions passed by the Convention, and fraudulently substituted the others. Lanhier then, as now, was the editor of the *Register*, so that there seems to be but little room for his escape. But then it is to be borne in mind that Lanhier had less interest in the object of that forgery than either of the other two. *reOtSBSMi* 1 The main object of that forgery at that time was to beat Yates and elect Harris to Congress, and that object was known to be exceedingly dear to Judge Douglas at that time, *re-i/* *entcheft* Harris and Douglas were both in Springfield when the Convention was in session, and although they both left before the fraud appeared in the *Register*, subsequent events show the fraud having been apparently successful upon the occasion, both Harris and Douglas have more than once since then been attempting to put it to new uses. As the fisherman's wife, whose drowned husband had been brought home with a load of eels, said when she was asked, "What

waa to be done yvitb .: ^:/ .^ji^ Ayy-c^ him?" " 2'ake the eeU out and set Mm again." InraafcilimBtitar ;j so Harris and Douglas have shown a disposition to take the eels out of that stale fraud by which they gained Harris' elec- tion, and set the fraud again more than once. 1'freiMia.ii6iing,ad laughter. On the Ulh of July, ISoC), Douglas iittempted a repeti- tion of it upon Trumbull on the floor of the Senate of the United States, as will appear from the appendix of the Congresmn&l Qlobe of that date. On the 9th of August Harris attempted it again upon Norton in the House of Representa- , - ^ fives, as will appear by the same documents the appendix to the Congressional Globe of that .. date. On the 21st of August<all three-ljan- phire, Douglas and Harris-1-re-attempted it upon me at Ottawa. Tremendous apjta8e. It has been clung to and played out again and again as an exceedingly high trump by this blessed trio. Boars of laughter and .tsiaili. OUS flpplauae, ' Give it to him," &c. j Anit now that it has been discovered publicly to be a fraud, we find that Judge Douglas manifests no surprise at it at all. |aughter, "'f-bfttUtji," "Jiiyw#aibj' He makes no complaint of ljanphire who must have known it to be a fraud from the beginning. BaljxLanphire and Harris are just as ^^^^now, and* just as active in the concoction of new schemes as they were before the general discovery of this fraud. Now all this is very natural if they are all alike guilty in that fraud, IMiUieK-aB4-chee% and it is very unnatural if any one of them ia innocent. Great.iiiugMBr^ . "-ilit him again," " Hurrah for Lincoln," Laiiphiro perhaps insists that tile rule of honor among thieves does not quite require him to take all upon himself, tia#ktfii, and consequently my friend Judge Douglas finds it difficult to make a satisfactory report upon his investigation. l4Jgi5&r,,nd ap- ; la*!e But meanwhile the three are agreed that each is " a iriost honorable rtianj'^ ^yIHtei?* j. an(iexidosi<tHfcftl'JieWr. Judge Douglas requires an indorsement of \ his truth and honor by a re election to the Uni- i ted States Senate, and he makes and reports j against me and against Judge Truinbuli day i after day charges which we know to be utterly ' untrue, without for a moment seeming to think that this one unexplained fraud, which he pro- mised to investigate, will be the least drawback to his claim to belief. Harris ditto. He asks a re-election to the lower House of Congress with- f out seeming to remember at all that heisin- ' volved in this dishonorable fraud ! The Illinois State liegister, edited by Lanphier, then, as now, the central organ of both Harris and Douglas, continues to din the public ear with this assertion vwithout seeming to suspect that these assertions are at all lacking in title to be- lief. After all, the question still recurs upon us, how did that fraud originally get into the State liegister ? Lanphier then as now was the edi- tor of that paper. Lanphier knows. Lanphier cannot be ignorant of how and by whom it was originally concocted. Can he be induced to tell, , or if he has told, can Judge Douglas be induced to tell how if, originally was concocted? It may be true that Lanphier insists that the two men for whose benefit it was originally devised, shall , at least bear their share of it I How that is, I do not know, and while it remains unexplained I hope to be pardoned if I insist that the mere tact of Judge Dougias making charges against Trumbull and myself is not quite sdficient evi dence toestablisli them ! S,f.at.cheeringi"Ui!. hiaj again." -"Givs-itto-hira," &c. Willie we were at Freeport, in one of these joint discusssions, I ansv/ered certain interrog- atories which Judge

Douglas had propounded to me, and there in turn propounded some to him, which he in a sort of way answered. The third one of these interrogatories I have with me and wish now to make some comments upon it. It was in these words: "If the Supreme " Court of the United States shall decide that " the States cannot exclude slavery from their " limits, are you in favor of acquiescing in, adhering to and following such decision, as a " rule of political action ?" To this interrogatory Judge Douglas made no answer in any just sense of the word. He contented himself with sneering at the thought that it was possible for the Supreme Court ever to make such a decision. He sneered at me for propounding the interrogatory. I had not propounded it without some reflection, and I wish now to address to this audience some remarks upon it. In the second clause of the sixth article, I believe it is of the Constitution of the United States, we find the following language: "This " Constitution and the laws of the United " States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties or which shall be " made under the authority of the United " States, shall be the supreme law of the land; "and the judges in every State shall be bound " thereby anything in the Constitution or laws " of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." "The essence of the Dred Scott case is comprised into the sentence which I will now read: " Now, as we have already said in an earlier "part of this opinion, upon a different point, the "right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution." I repeat it, " The right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution." What is affirmed by the Constitution? Made firm in the Constitution so made that it cannot be separated from the Constitution without breaking the Constitution durable as the Constitution.

Now, upon that Convention. . . , - remembering the provision of the Constitution /IA- .zAJ>-^J^ Ojk (^

|| - ^ ||

"V-| v-"^ which I have read, affirming that that instrument is the supreme law of the land; that the Judges of every State shall be bound by it, any law or Constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding; that the right of property in a slave is affirmed in that Constitution, is made, formed into and cannot be separated from it (without breaking it; durable as the instrument; part of the instrument; what follows as a short preparation of the public mind to take it up when it comes, without any inquiry. -Ju this I think I argue fairly (without questioning motives at all that Judge Douglas is most ingeniously and powerfully preparing the public mind to take that decision when it comes : and not only so, but he is doing it in various other ways, in the general maxims about liberty in his assertions. that he " don't care whether Slavery is voted up " whoever wants Slav-



! "">,"=" ""/"K"?;""*r""""V':""""% I "erv has a tiiht to have it;" that " npoj it iollows, and I submit to the consideration of . ' .-.-., \ ^nd even syllogistic argument from it ? I think Z^^tt^ tTi^h't to N it follows, and r submit tn the nnnaidp.ratinn nf l ery has a tl-ni 10 / a \ men capable of arguing, whether as I state it in syllogistic form the argument has apj fault in it ; , ' Nothing in the Oonstttution or laws of any / / / State can destroy a right distinctly and express- f-/y' ly affirmed in the Constitution of the United ^" _pBlates. ., , The right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution ot toe United States; ^ ^-^herefore^' nothing in the Oonstitutioa or laws . of any State can destroy the right of property in a slave, 1 believe that no fault can be pointed out in that argument; assuming the truth of the pre- mises, the'conclusi)n, so far as 1 have capacity at all to understand it, follows inevitably. There is a fault in it as I think, but the fault is not in the reasoning; but the fal^ehoo(l in fact is a fault of the pfemises.' I believe that the right of property in a slave u not distinctly and ex- pressly affirmed in the Constitution, and Judge Douglas thinks it is, I believe thatjthe Supreme Court and the advocates of that decision may search in vain for the place in the Uoiistitution where the ri,i;ht ot property in a slaye is dis- ju tinctly and eVpressly allirmeij. 1 say, there- fore, that 1 think one of the premises is not true in fact. But it is true with J udge Uouglas. It is true with the Suprenie Oourt who pro- nouncee4 't. They are estopped from denying it, and being estopped lrom denying it, the : conclusion follows thjit the Constitution of the United States being the ^i?preme law, no constitutioi5 g,: iaw can interfere with it. Itbelng allirmed in the decis- ion that the right of property in a slave is dis- tinctly and expressly allirnied \-\ the Cpastitu- tion, the conclusion inevitably follows that no tiiate law or ciongtitntion isaiijdsstroy that right. \ then say to Judfje Kouglas and to all others, that Ltink it will take jjietter answoi-^,an ^ sneer to sliow that lh';-:cuo have said"that the right of y,7operty in aslaVS is distinctly and ex- ^; pressly affirmed in the Constitution, are not pre- pared to show that no constitution or law can Peatroy that right. 1 say 1 belieye it willtai?e a lar tietter arguiusnt than a mere sneer to show to the minds of intelligent men that whoever has so said, is not prepared, whenever public sentiment is so far advanced as to justify it, to say the other. "Thatimiiw" This is but an opin- ion, and the opinion of one very humble man ; but it is my opinion that the l),red Scott decision, as it ig, never wp'uld hjiive been made in its pre- sent form if the party that made it had not been sustained previously by the elections. My own opinion is, that the new Dred Scott decision, de- ciding against the right of the people of the States to exclude slavery, will never be made, if that pafy is not sustained by the elections. Cries of"-Y-es,"ye8." I believe, further, that it is just as sure to be 'made as t6-m,orrow is to come, if that party shall be sustained. ^"-Ws' won't sustain it, never,>DTer." I have said, upon a former occasion, and I repeat it now, that the course of argument that Judge Doug- las makes use of upon this subject, (1 charge not his motives in this), is preparing the public mind for that new Dred Scott decision. 1 have asked him again to point out to n)e the reasons for hig firm adherence to the Dred Scott decis- ion as it is. I have turned his'attention to

the foot that general Jackson differed with him in regard to the political obligation of a Supreme Court decision. I have asked his attention to the fact that Jefferson differed with him in regard to the political obligation of a Supreme Court decision. Jefferson said, that "Judges are as honest as other men, and not more so." And he said, substantially, that "whenever a free people should give up in absolute submission to any department of government, retaining for themselves no appeal from it, their liberties were gone." I have asked his attention to, the fact that the Cincinnati platform, upon which he says he stands, disregards a time-honored decision of the Supreme Court, in denying the power of Congress to establish a National Bank. I have asked his attention to the fact that, he himself was one of the most active instruments of the est-ill^^, at one time in support of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, because it had made a decision distasteful to him in a struggle ending in the remarkable circumstance of his sitting down as one of the new Judges who were to overrule that decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, getting his title of Judge in that very way. I have asked his attention to the fact that, he himself was one of the most active instruments of the est-ill^^, at one time in support of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, because it had made a decision distasteful to him in a struggle ending in the remarkable circumstance of his sitting down as one of the new Judges who were to overrule that decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, getting his title of Judge in that very way. So far in this controversy I can get no answer at all from Judge Douglas upon these subjects. Not one can I get from him, except that he swells himself up and says, "All of us who stand by the decision of the Supreme Court are the friends of the Constitution. All you fellows that dare question it in any way are the enemies of the Constitution. In this very devoted adherence to this decision, in opposition to all the great political leaders whom he has recognized as leaders in opposition to his former self and history, there is something very marked. And the manner in which he adheres to it not as being right upon the merits, as he conceives (because he did not discuss that at all), but as being absolutely obligatory upon every one simply because of the source from whence it comes as that which no man can gainsay, whatever it may be, this is another marked feature of his adherence to that decision. It marks it in this respect, that it commits him to the next decision, whenever it comes, as being as obligatory as this one, since he does not investigate it, and won't inquire whether this opinion is right or wrong. So he takes the next one without inquiring whether it is right or wrong. He teaches this doctrine, and insisting "to go everywhere"; that "there is no inconsistency between free and slave institutions." In this he is also preparing (whether purposely or not) the way for making the institution of Slavery national! I repeat again, for I wish no misunderstanding, that I do not charge that he means it so; but I call upon your minds to inquire, if you were going to get the best instrument you could, and then set it to work in the most ingenious way, to prepare the public mind for this movement, operating in the free States, where there is now an abhorrence of the institution of Slavery, could you find an instrument so capable of doing it as Judge Douglas? or one employed in so apt a way to do it?" | *)'i'o>iit,iifltiWiri,iil 4U4es,.<f-*iit~iitwt.8gawi"- 1; "That's the doctrine" I have said once before, and I will repeat it now, that Mr. Clay, when he was once answering an objection to the Colonization Society, that it had a tendency to the ultimate emancipation of the slaves, said that "those who would repress all tendencies to liberty and ultimate emancipation must do more than

put down the "benevolent efforts of the Colonization Society "they must go back to the era of our liberty and the "independence and muzzle the cannon that thunders its annual joyous return they must hold out the moral lights around us they must penetrate the human soul, and eradicate the light of reason and the love of liberty !" And I do, think I repeat, though I said it on a former occasion that Judge Douglas, and whoever like him teaches that the negro has no share, humble though it may be, in the Declaration of Independence, is going back to the era of our liberty and independence, and, so far as in him lies, muzzling the cannon that thunders its annual joyous return; (Mutilinili)." that he is telling out the moral lights around us, when he contends that whoever wants slaves has a right to hold them; that he is penetrating, so far as lies in his power, the human soul, and eradicating the light of reason and the love of liberty, when he is in every possible way pre-pairing the public mind, by his vast influence, for making the institution of slavery perpetual and unalterable. (Judge Douglas's applause, and cries of "Urrah, Lincoln," "That's the true doctrine. There is, my friends, only one other point to which I will call your attention for the remaining time that I have left me, and perhaps I shall not occupy the entire time that I have, as that one point may not take me clear through it. Among the interrogatories that Judge Douglas presented to me at Freeport, there was one in about this language: "Are you opposed to the acquisition of any further territory to the United States, unless slavery shall first be prohibited therein ? " I answered as I thought, in this way, that I am not generally opposed to the acquisition of additional territory, and that I would support a proposition for the acquisition of additional territory, according as my supporting it was or was not calculated to aggravate this slavery question amongst us. I then proposed to Judge Douglas another interrogatory, which was correlative to that: "Are you in favor of acquiring additional territory in disregard of how it may affect us upon the slavery question ?" Judge Douglas answered, that is, in his own way he answered it. I believe that, although he took a good many words to answer it, it was a little more fully answered than any other. The substance of his answer was, that this country would continue to expand that it would need additional territory that it was as absurd to suppose that we could continue upon our present territory, enlarging in population as we are, as it would be to hoop a boy twelve years of age, and expect him to grow to man's size without bursting the hoops. That I believe it was something like that. Consequently he was in favor of the acquisition of further territory, as fast as we might need it, in disregard of how it might affect the slavery question. I do not say this as giving his exact language, but he said so substantially, and he would leave the question of slavery where the territory was acquired, to be settled by the people of the acquired territory. " That's the doctrine." May be it is ; let us consider that for a while. This will probably, in the run of things, become one of the concrete manifestations of this slavery question. If Judge Douglas' policy upon this question succeeds, and gets fairly settled down, until all opposition is crushed out, the next thing will be a grab for the territory of poor Mexico, an invasion of the rich lands of South America, then the adjoining islands will follow, each one of which promises additional slave fields. And this question is to be left to the people of those countries for settlement.

When we shall get Mexico, I don't know whether the Judge will be in Tavor of the Mexican people that we get with it settling that question for therr:selves and all others; because we know the J ude has a great horror for mongrels, linnghtwr, and I under- stand that the people of Mexico are most deci- dedly a race of mongrels. iiBlI'tfWliidlimj^h >oi'i j- I understand that there is not more than one person there out of eight who is pure white, and 1 suppose from the Judge's previous declaration that when we get Mexico or any considerable portion of it, that he will be in favor ot these mongrels settling the question, which would bring him somewhat into collision with his hor- ror of an inferior race. It is to be remembered, though, that this power of acquiring additional territory is a power confided to the President and Senate of the United States. It is a power not under the control of the Representatives of the people any V i ^h4.^^^1I^j^.

;---k*y^

I af /'^S-

* -ilites^ - further than the^ the President and the Senate can be considered the representatives of^tlie people. Let me illustrate that by a cas-> we territory from Mexico in the Mexican war, the House of Representatives, composed of the im mediate representatives of the people all the time insisted that the territory thus to he ac quired should be brought in unbq condition tha f n'7h'*''''* be fo,?ever prWibited therein upon the terms and m the language thutalaverv had been prohibited from coming into tMs country. That was insisted upon constantly an;rrt;rv th,l '''' ''''^ \ o^^rnce th^J nrohiw''^^ ''''^ acquired should have that sem^aHvTs''i'' '' '' -^''''I^' ^ouse of Repre Presdnt - mH%''''f ''- ^'' ^t ^^^t the without asWrn^ll ''''''''7i *'^ *^'-y anything about it !.?'t ?' ^-^Pfesentativei hibition^ They have ttle^ ^''''^o'' ''lat pro- in ada tional territory withon? v.^L-. ' ''^''S ed as the policy of the country ' Yo " tin t'^'' n mind that it" is to be aeauire.' , *' *'''' the Judge's view as "v^t 1 f^ ' ''^'^W'^mg to theinde1in.-t"oar\ofA^t * " ^ needed, tnd have oni^j4?l,lX Zflf'^'^^ ^it we todecid/ how^ast fiane.aed lr, '''' " clear and certain wav of rijfXi-' *** ''''^ , Btrating how S Si?lrytSe?bv h'''''''' cessitips of the countrv '^wi, ^ ^y the ne- out mUbusterin?"hen^"thin^8 ?hlf ^''''/ * ry is needed. WhoeTer wii ''''^ ^''''''- aelds, feels sure that some a^ldt=.71''f ^''''^ 3 needed as slaye torritaiy 1^^- ' *''-' ? oVyt''it1s%:''''^''''^ ^'^'^<^"--l !-" a man or aet <,f ml,? . Whatever motive a uexa ion of nrmorTvor?^ ^j''''''^'' ''''''WK an- to assert. bZZcXZ ea'sy to^i'' ^''7, f ^ W aeossary , r the wanfs ojthetSatry' '''''' .^KhltIta^y'^aTn^X^S -'.^' ' / of this Union to conside? wteth.r il^ P*''''''!- - Union that has ever disturbed no ;,, u way as to make us fear for tte pernetui^v J?r *'' '' iiberty-4n view of these faetl'I^PhLt'^tt a"a igly mterestin,, avi,) im ,.* ' ''''^* of negro equality, and to assert that by the Beclara tion of Independence the negro is ueclared equal to the white man. He tells you to-day that the ne- gro was included in the Declaration of Independ- ence when it asserted that all men were created equal. . ("W- ieljeve it.") Very well. {Uam^&u aproar arose, petsonsia-various



parts of the... in cat o'alls; groans, cheers, and other noises, preventing the speaker from proceeding.) Mr. Lincoln was listened to respectfully, and I have the right to insist that I shall not be interrupted during my reply. Mr. Lincoln asserts to-day as he did at Chicago, that the negro was included in that clause of the Declaration of Independence which says that all men were created equal and endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. (A) If the negro was made his equal and mine, if that equality was established by Divine law, and was the negro's inalienable right, how came he to say at Charleston that the Kon-tucksans residing in that section of our State, that the negro was physically inferior to the white man, belonged to an inferior race, and he was for keeping him always in that inferior condition. (B) I wish you to bear these things in mind. At Charleston he said that the negro belonged to an inferior race, and that he was for keeping him in that inferior condition. There he gave the people to understand that there was no moral question involved because the inferiority being established, it was only a question of degree and not a question of right; here to-day, instead of making it a question of degree, he makes it a moral question, sirs, that it is a great crime to hold the negro in that inferior condition, (C) Is he right now or was he right in Charleston? (D) He is right then sir in your estimation, not because he is consistent but because he can find his principles any way in any section, so as to secure votes." All I desire of him is that he will declare the same principles in the South that he does in the North. (E) But did you notice how he answered my position that a man should hold the same doctrines through the length and breadth of this republic? (F) He would remind him that Russia is not the American constitution. (G) If Russia was a part of the American federal constitution, and I was sworn to support that constitution. I would maintain the same thing? (H) Illinois - The slaveholding States are, governed by the same federal constitution as ourselves, and hence a man's principles in order to be in harmony with the constitution, must be the same in the South as they are in the North, the same in the free States as they are in the slave States. Whenever a man advocates one set of principles in one section, and another in another section, and advocates a violation of the spirit of the constitution which he is on the verge of endangering element to our liberties? (I) My view has been written in the press? (J) An important and practical question, a conclusion as to whether it is or is not important that they shall Heretofore that question? (K) And now, my friends, having said the little to you? (L) I have ten more to say for you? (M) I have ten more to say for you? (N) I have ten more to say for you? (O) I have ten more to say for you? (P) I have ten more to say for you? (Q) I have ten more to say for you? (R) I have ten more to say for you? (S) I have ten more to say for you? (T) I have ten more to say for you? (U) I have ten more to say for you? (V) I have ten more to say for you? (W) I have ten more to say for you? (X) I have ten more to say for you? (Y) I have ten more to say for you? (Z) I have ten more to say for you? (AA) I have ten more to say for you? (AB) I have ten more to say for you? (AC) I have ten more to say for you? (AD) I have ten more to say for you? (AE) I have ten more to say for you? (AF) I have ten more to say for you? (AG) I have ten more to say for you? (AH) I have ten more to say for you? (AI) I have ten more to say for you? (AJ) I have ten more to say for you? (AK) I have ten more to say for you? (AL) I have ten more to say for you? (AM) I have ten more to say for you? (AN) I have ten more to say for you? (AO) I have ten more to say for you? (AP) I have ten more to say for you? (AQ) I have ten more to say for you? (AR) I have ten more to say for you? (AS) I have ten more to say for you? (AT) I have ten more to say for you? (AU) I have ten more to say for you? (AV) I have ten more to say for you? (AW) I have ten more to say for you? (AX) I have ten more to say for you? (AY) I have ten more to say for you? (AZ) I have ten more to say for you? (BA) I have ten more to say for you? (BB) I have ten more to say for you? (BC) I have ten more to say for you? (BD) I have ten more to say for you? (BE) I have ten more to say for you? (BF) I have ten more to say for you? (BG) I have ten more to say for you? (BH) I have ten more to say for you? (BI) I have ten more to say for you? (BJ) I have ten more to say for you? (BK) I have ten more to say for you? (BL) I have ten more to say for you? (BM) I have ten more to say for you? (BN) I have ten more to say for you? (BO) I have ten more to say for you? (BP) I have ten more to say for you? (BQ) I have ten more to say for you? (BR) I have ten more to say for you? (BS) I have ten more to say for you? (BT) I have ten more to say for you? (BU) I have ten more to say for you? (BV) I have ten more to say for you? (BW) I have ten more to say for you? (BX) I have ten more to say for you? (BY) I have ten more to say for you? (BZ) I have ten more to say for you? (CA) I have ten more to say for you? (CB) I have ten more to say for you? (CC) I have ten more to say for you? (CD) I have ten more to say for you? (CE) I have ten more to say for you? (CF) I have ten more to say for you? (CG) I have ten more to say for you? (CH) I have ten more to say for you? (CI) I have ten more to say for you? (CJ) I have ten more to say for you? (CK) I have ten more to say for you? (CL) I have ten more to say for you? (CM) I have ten more to say for you? (CN) I have ten more to say for you? (CO) I have ten more to say for you? (CP) I have ten more to say for you? (CQ) I have ten more to say for you? (CR) I have ten more to say for you? (CS) I have ten more to say for you? (CT) I have ten more to say for you? (CU) I have ten more to say for you? (CV) I have ten more to say for you? (CW) I have ten more to say for you? (CX) I have ten more to say for you? (CY) I have ten more to say for you? (CZ) I have ten more to say for you? (DA) I have ten more to say for you? (DB) I have ten more to say for you? (DC) I have ten more to say for you? (DD) I have ten more to say for you? (DE) I have ten more to say for you? (DF) I have ten more to say for you? (DG) I have ten more to say for you? (DH) I have ten more to say for you? (DI) I have ten more to say for you? (DJ) I have ten more to say for you? (DK) I have ten more to say for you? (DL) I have ten more to say for you? (DM) I have ten more to say for you? (DN) I have ten more to say for you? (DO) I have ten more to say for you? (DP) I have ten more to say for you? (DQ) I have ten more to say for you? (DR) I have ten more to say for you? (DS) I have ten more to say for you? (DT) I have ten more to say for you? (DU) I have ten more to say for you? (DV) I have ten more to say for you? (DW) I have ten more to say for you? (DX) I have ten more to say for you? (DY) I have ten more to say for you? (DZ) I have ten more to say for you? (EA) I have ten more to say for you? (EB) I have ten more to say for you? (EC) I have ten more to say for you? (ED) I have ten more to say for you? (EE) I have ten more to say for you? (EF) I have ten more to say for you? (EG) I have ten more to say for you? (EH) I have ten more to say for you? (EI) I have ten more to say for you? (EJ) I have ten more to say for you? (EK) I have ten more to say for you? (EL) I have ten more to say for you? (EM) I have ten more to say for you? (EN) I have ten more to say for you? (EO) I have ten more to say for you? (EP) I have ten more to say for you? (EQ) I have ten more to say for you? (ER) I have ten more to say for you? (ES) I have ten more to say for you? (ET) I have ten more to say for you? (EU) I have ten more to say for you? (EV) I have ten more to say for you? (EW) I have ten more to say for you? (EX) I have ten more to say for you? (EY) I have ten more to say for you? (EZ) I have ten more to say for you? (FA) I have ten more to say for you? (FB) I have ten more to say for you? (FC) I have ten more to say for you? (FD) I have ten more to say for you? (FE) I have ten more to say for you? (FF) I have ten more to say for you? (FG) I have ten more to say for you? (FH) I have ten more to say for you? (FI) I have ten more to say for you? (FJ) I have ten more to say for you? (FK) I have ten more to say for you? (FL) I have ten more to say for you? (FM) I have ten more to say for you? (FN) I have ten more to say for you? (FO) I have ten more to say for you? (FP) I have ten more to say for you? (FQ) I have ten more to say for you? (FR) I have ten more to say for you? (FS) I have ten more to say for you? (FT) I have ten more to say for you? (FU) I have ten more to say for you? (FV) I have ten more to say for you? (FW) I have ten more to say for you? (FX) I have ten more to say for you? (FY) I have ten more to say for you? (FZ) I have ten more to say for you? (GA) I have ten more to say for you? (GB) I have ten more to say for you? (GC) I have ten more to say for you? (GD) I have ten more to say for you? (GE) I have ten more to say for you? (GF) I have ten more to say for you? (GG) I have ten more to say for you? (GH) I have ten more to say for you? (GI) I have ten more to say for you? (GJ) I have ten more to say for you? (GK) I have ten more to say for you? (GL) I have ten more to say for you? (GM) I have ten more to say for you? (GN) I have ten more to say for you? (GO) I have ten more to say for you? (GP) I have ten more to say for you? (GQ) I have ten more to say for you? (GR) I have ten more to say for you? (GS) I have ten more to say for you? (GT) I have ten more to say for you? (GU) I have ten more to say for you? (GV) I have ten more to say for you? (GW) I have ten more to say for you? (GX) I have ten more to say for you? (GY) I have ten more to say for you? (GZ) I have ten more to say for you? (HA) I have ten more to say for you? (HB) I have ten more to say for you? (HC) I have ten more to say for you? (HD) I have ten more to say for you? (HE) I have ten more to say for you? (HF) I have ten more to say for you? (HG) I have ten more to say for you? (HH) I have ten more to say for you? (HI) I have ten more to say for you? (HJ) I have ten more to say for you? (HK) I have ten more to say for you? (HL) I have ten more to say for you? (HM) I have ten more to say for you? (HN) I have ten more to say for you? (HO) I have ten more to say for you? (HP) I have ten more to say for you? (HQ) I have ten more to say for you? (HR) I have ten more to say for you? (HS) I have ten more to say for you? (HT) I have ten more to say for you? (HU) I have ten more to say for you? (HV) I have ten more to say for you? (HW) I have ten more to say for you? (HX) I have ten more to say for you? (HY) I have ten more to say for you? (HZ) I have ten more to say for you? (IA) I have ten more to say for you? (IB) I have ten more to say for you? (IC) I have ten more to say for you? (ID) I have ten more to say for you? (IE) I have ten more to say for you? (IF) I have ten more to say for you? (IG) I have ten more to say for you? (IH) I have ten more to say for you? (IJ) I have ten more to say for you? (IK) I have ten more to say for you? (IL) I have ten more to say for you? (IM) I have ten more to say for you? (IN) I have ten more to say for you? (IO) I have ten more to say for you? (IP) I have ten more to say for you? (IQ) I have ten more to say for you? (IR) I have ten more to say for you? (IS) I have ten more to say for you? (IT) I have ten more to say for you? (IU) I have ten more to say for you? (IV) I have ten more to say for you? (IW) I have ten more to say for you? (IX) I have ten more to say for you? (IY) I have ten more to say for you? (IZ) I have ten more to say for you? (JA) I have ten more to say for you? (JB) I have ten more to say for you? (JC) I have ten more to say for you? (JD) I have ten more to say for you? (JE) I have ten more to say for you? (JF) I have ten more to say for you? (JG) I have ten more to say for you? (JH) I have ten more to say for you? (JI) I have ten more to say for you? (JJ) I have ten more to say for you? (JK) I have ten more to say for you? (JL) I have ten more to say for you? (JM) I have ten more to say for you? (JN) I have ten more to say for you? (JO) I have ten more to say for you? (JP) I have ten more to say for you? (JQ) I have ten more to say for you? (JR) I have ten more to say for you? (JS) I have ten more to say for you? (JT) I have ten more to say for you? (JU) I have ten more to say for you? (JV) I have ten more to say for you? (JW) I have ten more to say for you? (JX) I have ten more to say for you? (JY) I have ten more to say for you? (JZ) I have ten more to say for you? (KA) I have ten more to say for you? (KB) I have ten more to say for you? (KC) I have ten more to say for you? (KD) I have ten more to say for you? (KE) I have ten more to say for you? (KF) I have ten more to say for you? (KG) I have ten more to say for you? (KH) I have ten more to say for you? (KI) I have ten more to say for you? (KJ) I have ten more to say for you? (KK) I have ten more to say for you? (KL) I have ten more to say for you? (KM) I have ten more to say for you? (KN) I have ten more to say for

said everywhere else in the State where I have addressed myself - I wish I could say the same of Mr. Sreech. (I told you I met him. and I would like to know the reason I complain of him is because he makes one speech north and another south, (I will say) Because he has one set of sentiments for Cabington counties and another for Springfield, and he is opposed to abolitionists. He is not a standard, to carry no name of the State. He does not pretend, and no other man will, that I have one Charles C. Smith in one part of the State and another in another part. (I do not pretend that I am a Democrat in one part of the State and a Republican in another. It would have set me at a doubtful count. Here I understand him to reaffirm the doctrine - ----- Congress in 1847, and laying his hand upon the holy evangelists, made a solemn belief of the constitution as he expounds it in Galesburg. Mr. Lincoln has devoted considerable time to the circumstance that at Ottawa I read a series of resolutions as having been adopted at Springfield, in this State, on the 4th or 5th of October, 1854 which happened not to have been adopted there. He has used hard names; has dared to talk about fraud in Illinois about forgery, and has insinuated that there was a conspiracy between Mr. Lanphier, Mr. Harris, and myself to perpetrate a forgery. Now, bear in mind that he does not deny that these resolutions were adopted in a majority of all the Republican counties of this State in that year; he does not deny that they were declared to be the platform of this Republican party in the first Congressional district, in the second in the third, and in many counties of the fourth, and that they thus became the platform of his party in a majority of the counties upon which he now relies for support; he does not deny the truthfulness of the resolutions, but takes exception to the spot on which they were adopted. He takes to himself great merit because he thinks they were not adopted on the right spot for me to use them against him just as he was very severe in Congress upon the government of his country when he thought that he had discovered that the Mexican war was not begun in the right spot, and was therefore unjust. He tries very hard to make out that there is something very extraordinary in the place where the thing was done, and not in the thing itself. I never believed before that Abraham Lincoln would be guilty of what he has done this day in regard to those resolutions. In the first place, the moment it was intimated to me that they had been adopted at Aurora and Rockford instead of Springfield, I did not wait for him to call my attention to the fact, but led off and explained in my first meeting after the Ottawa debate, what the mistake was, and how it had been made. I supposed that for an honest man, conscious of his own rectitude, that explanation would be sufficient. I did not wait for him, after the mistake was made to call my attention to it, but frankly explained it at once as an honest man would. I also gave the authority on which I had stated that these resolutions were adopted by the Springfield Republican convention. That I had seen them quoted by Major Harris in a debate in Congress, as having been adopted by the first Republican State convention in Illinois, and that I had written to him and asked him for the authority as to the time and place of their adoption; that Major Harris being ex-

remely Hl, Charles H. Linphier had wr^itten nie for h.m. that they were adopted at Springfield, on the 6th of October, 1854 andhadsentmea copy of the Springfield paper containing them. I read them from the newspaper just as Mr. Lincoln reads the proceedings of meet ings Held years ago from the newspapers. After giving that explanation, I did not think there was fh ?^1*'^ u " ^ ' ' 1 " * * ^tate of Illinois who doubted that 1 had been led into the error, if it was such, Ill isfTS^'- iidi^iit'

i \

r^, -j--'"^~V.ii^u ' ^ "" ^ei^ innocently, m the way 1 deailed ; and 1 wiit now say that I do not now believe that there is an hon- est man on the face of the globe who will not re- gard with abhorrence and disgust Mr. Lincoln's in- sinuations of my complicity in that forgery, if it was a forgery. (Utanf^.) Does Mr. Lincoln wish to push these things to the point of personal difficul- ties here ? I commenced this contest by treating him courteously and kindly; 1 always spoke of him in words of respect, and in return he has sought, and is now seeking, to divert public attention from the enormity of his revolutionary principles by impeaching men's sincerity and integrity, and in- vitmg personal quarrels. ^UU:eiW<>'ferif,"ttd'CbeeT.) I desired to conduct this contest with him like a gentleman, but I spurn the msiuuation of com- plicity and fraud made upon the simple circum- stance of an editor of a newspaper having made a mistake as to the place where a thing was done, but not as to the taing itself. These resolutions were the platform of this Republican party of Mr. Lincoln's of that year. They were adopted in a majority of the Republican counties in the State; and when I asked him at Ottawa whether they formed the platform upon which he stood, he did not answer, and I could not get an answer out of him. He then thought, as I thought, that those resolutions were adopted at the Springfield con vention, but excused himself by saying that he was not there when they were adopted, but had gone to Tazewell court in order to avoid being present at the convention. He saw them pub- lished as having been adopted at SpringHeld, and so did I, and he knew that if there was a mistake in regard to them, that 1 had nothing under heaven to do with it. Besides, you find that in all these northern counties where the Republi- can candidates are running pledged to him, that the eonventions which nominated them adopted that identical platform. One cardinal point in that platform which he shrinks from is this that there shall be no more slave States admitted into the Union, even if the people want them. Lovejoy stands pledged against the admission of any more slave States. (Right, so do we.) So do you, you say. Farnsworth stands pledged aga nst the ad- mission of any more slave States. (Mi in I iigilili) Washburne stands pledged the same way. (6teii gaonii^ The candidate for the legislature who is running on Lincoln's ticket in Henderson and War- ren, stands committed by his vote in the legislature to the same thing, and 1 am informed, but d.> not know of the fact, that your candidate here is also so pledged. (Hurrah tor him, good.) Now, you Republicans all hurrah for him, and for the doc- trine of " no more slave States," and yet Lincoln tells you that his conscience will not permit him to sanction that doctrine. (tawn^ijflo pp4fte.) And

complains because the resolutions I read at Ottawa made him as a member of the party, responsible for sanctioning the doctrine of no more slave States. You are one way, you confess, and he is or viretends to be the other, and yet you are both governed by principle in supporting one another. If it be, true, as I have shown it is, that the whole Republican party in the northern part of the State stands committed to the doctrine of no more slave States, and that this same doctrine is repudiated by the Republicans in the other part of the State, I wonder whether Mr. Lincoln and his party do not present the case which he cited from the Scriptures, of a house divided against itself which cannot stand! CSreioeadfliii* shouts of ap|>IB.) I desire to know what are Mr. Lincoln's principles and the principles of his party? I hold, and the party with which I am identified hold, that the people of each State, old and new. the courts of iustioe. ("iliora no.") He complains because I did not go into an argument reviewing Chief Justice Taney's opinion⁷ and the other opinions of the different judges, to determine whether their reasoning is right or wrong on the questions of law. What use would that be? He wants to take an appeal from the Supreme Court to this meeting to determine whether the questions of law were decided properly. He is going to appeal from the Supreme Court of the United States to every town meeting in the hope that he can excite a prejudice against that court, and on the wave of that prejudice ride into the Senate of the United States, when he could not get there on his own principles, or his own merits. (t->"gi'tffr ^^Hd fhflarwj ^^itr-inf^---g-m,") Suppose he should succeed in getting into the Senate of the United States, what then will he have to do with the decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case? Can he reverse that decision when he gets there? Can he act upon it? Has the Senate any right to reverse it or revise it? He will not pretend that it has. Then why drag the matter into this contest, unless for the purpose of making a false issue, by which he can direct public attention from the real issue. He has cited General Jackson in justification of the war he is making on the decision of the court. Mr. Lincoln misunderstands the history of the controversy, if he believes there is any parallel in the two cases. It is true that the Supreme Court once decided that if a bank of the United States was a necessary fiscal agent of the government, it was constitutional, and it not, that it was unconstitutional, and also, that whether or not it was necessary for that purpose, was a political question for Congress and not a judicial one for the courts to determine. Hence the court would not determine the bank unconstitutional. Jackson respected the decision, obeyed the law, executed it and carried it into effect during its existence; (fliatii-aa,) but after the charter of the bank expired and a proposition was made to create a new bank, General Jackson said, "it is unnecessary, and improper, and therefore, I am against it on constitutional grounds as well as those of expediency." Is Congress bound to pass every act that is constitutional? Why, there are a thousand things that are constitutional, but yet are inexpedient and unnecessary, and you surely would not vote for them merely because you had the right to? And because General Jackson would not do a thing which he had a right to do, but did not deem expedient or proper, Mr. Lincoln is going to justify himself in doing that which he has no right to do. (tiiiilghfiafc) I ask him, whether he is not bound to respect and obey the decisions of the Supreme Court as well as

me? The Constitution has created that Court to decide all constitutional questions in the last resort, and when such decisions have been made, they become the law of the land, ^UwWw'SOj) and you, and he, and myself, and every other good citizen are bound by them. Yet, he argues that I am bound by their decisions and he is not. He says that their decisions are binding on Democrats, but not on Republicans. '(bnugtitBi applnano.) Are not Republicans bound ad- by the laws, of the land, as well as Uem crats? And when the court has fixed the construction of the constitution on the validity of a given law, is not their decision binding upon Republicans as well as upon Democrats ? (it^a8^i4to<b.) Is it possi- ble that you Republicans Lave the right to raise your mobs and oppose the laws of the land and the constituted authorities, and yet hold us Democrats bound to obey them ? My time is within half a minute of expiring, and all I have to say is, that I stand by the laws of the land. (TiotiMtf-bMrrsh- u '4^ 1.1 i- j- j lu 1 - i- r ' '***e'g*8-) I stand by the constitution as our have the right to decide the slavery question for fathers made it hv tho low= c *i,o i. j themselves f'*W^a^8*h^ f d by' re'dVcisl^ns^oVthe c^ur 'Tpor^ITp^ ^?s ,^mm,) and when I used the remark that I dTT^t within their jurisdiction as they are pronounced bv care whether slavery was voted up or down, I used the highest tribunal on earth; and any man who It in the connection that I was for allowing Kansas resists these must resort to jnob law and violence to to do lust as she pleased on the slavery question. I overturn the government of laws ^oieaceto said that I did not care whether they voted slavery up or down, because they had the right to do as they pleased on the question, and therefore my ac- tion .. ould not be controlled by any such considera- tion. {^aeiS-tbmisiS^m<i.} Why cannot Abraham Lincoln, and the party with,which he acts, ppeak out their principles so that they may be under- stood. Why do they claim to be one thing in one part of the State and another in the other part. Whenever I allude to the abolition doctrines, which he considers a slander to be charged with being in favor of, you all endorse them, and hurrah for them, not knowing that your candidate is ashamed to acknowledge them. ("Sow-havO' tbam \ uwd obaam.) I have' a few words to say upon the Dred Scott decision, which has troubled the brain of Mr. Lin- coln so much, ^bntghtwv) He insists that that decision would carry slavery into the free States, notwithstanding that the decision says directly, the opposite; and goes into a long argument to make you believe that I am in favor of, and would sanc- tion the doctrine that would allow slaves to be brought here and held as slaves contrary to our constitution and laws. Mr. Lincoln knew better . when he asserted this; he knew that one newspaper, and so far as is within my knowledge, but one ever asserted that doctrine, and that I was the first man in either House of Congress that read that article in debate, and denounced it on the floor of the Senate as revolutionary^ When the Washington Union, on the 17th of last November published an article to that effect, I branded it at once, and de- - nounced it, and hence the Union has been pursuing me ever since. Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, replied to me, and said that thei e was not a man in any of the slave States south of the Potomac river that held any such doctrine., Mr. Lincoln knows that there is not a member of the Supreme Court who holds that doctrine; he knows that every one of them, as shown by their opinions, holds the reverse. Why

this attempt, then, to bring the Supreme Court into disrepute among the people? It looks as if there was an effort being made to destroy public confidence in the highest judicial tribunal on earth. Suppose he succeeds in destroying public confidence in the court, so that the people will not respect its decisions, but will feel at liberty to disregard them, and resist the laws of the land, what will he have gained? He will have changed the government from one of laws into that of a mob, in which the strong arm of violence will be substituted for the decisions of the court;

III II

f

'^%*:>y- | -t^-'

:>* A .>-

a^ 7 ^2^ ^^ ^^zWU^^^'^^ <^^ ^ |A^ '"-" y -/ }

L ilinri'iw -----'^?>>, I'! (^ QUINOY. ^i'^.l'^^ Mr. Lincoln's Speech. ^P' ^ -ALer.*--'?SJZ-.t?)f P*st two 'clock MK^LiB- :<JBili.w_as,intro<itt8fitl to the audience, and, hav- ^iM been .reqaj.ed with three-cheers, he pro . c^ded: Ladiss AMD Gentlemen : I have had no im- mediate conference with Judge Douglas, but I will Teuture to say he and I will perfectly agree that your entire silence both when I speak and when he speaks will be most agreeable to ns. In fte month of May, ISoG, the elements in the State of Illinois, which have since been con- solidated into the RepublicaD p'arty, assembled together in a State Convention at Bloomington. They adopted at that time what, in political lan- guage. is called a platform. In June of the same year, the elements of the Republican party in the nation assembled together in a National Convention at Philadelphia. They adopted what is called the National Platform. In June, 1858 the present year-the Republicans of Il'linois re-assembled at Springfield, in State Conven- tion, and adopted again their platform, as I suppose not differing in any essential particular trom either of the former ones, but - adding something in relation,to t-*=- "^^T ^? opments of political progre"- ',_ tir^M-?". '^^ The Convention tbV' ^^.^W J'^ ottntny did me the hor-., if'uT 1} l'ft"-* '^.-^ s.ifh tfi r-- - ^f^^ " -" "" ^*> ^^ r esteem it T?nit;- - -"''f- ""^ as their Candidate for the ^ "" ..d btates feenatft. I have supposed that in .otering upon this canvass I stood generally upon these platforms. We are now met togeth- er on the isth of October of the same year, on- q four months from the adoption of the last platform, and I am unaware that in this can- vass, from the beginning until today, any one of our adversaries has taken hold of our plat- forms or laid his finger upon anything that he calls wrong in them. Is the very first one of these joint discussions between Senator Douglaa and myself. Senator Douglas, without attuding at all to these plat- forms, or any One of them, of which I have spo- ken, attempted to hold me responsible for a set of res-

olutions passed long, before the meeting of either one of these Conventions of which I have spoken. And as a ground for holding me responsible for these resolutions, he assumed that they had been, passed at a State Conven- tion, of the Republican party, and that \ took part in that Convention. It was discovered af- terwards that this was erroneous, that the reso- lutions which he endeavored to hold me respon- sible for, had not been passed by anv State Con- vention anywhere had not been passed at Springfield, where, he supposed they had, or as- sumed that they had, and that they had been passed in no Convention in which 1 had taken part. The Judge, nevertheless, was not willing to give up the point that he was endeavoring to make upon me, and he therefore thought to still hold me to the point that he was endeavoring to make, by showing that the resolutions that he read, had been passed at a local Convention in the northern part of the State, although it was not a local Convention that embraced my resi- dence at all, nor one that reached, as I suppose, nearer than 130 or 200 miles of where I was when it met, nor one in which I took any part at all. He also introduced other resolutions passed at other meetings, and by combining the whole, although they were all antecedent to the two State Conventions, and the one National (jyn- vention I have mentioned, still he insisted and now insists, as 1 understand, that I am in some way responsible for them. At Jonesboro, on ourthird meeting, I insisted to the Judge that I was in no way rightfully held responsible for the proceedings of this local meeting or convention in which I had taken no part, and in which I was in no way embraced; but I insisted to him that if he thought I was responsible for every man or every set of men everywhere, who happen to be my friends, the rule ought to work both ways, and he ought to be responsible for the acts and resolutions of all men or seta of men who wei.e or are now his supporters and friends, good, good, and gave him a pretty long string of reso- lutions, passed by men who are now his friends, and announcing doctrines for which he does ndt desire to be held responble. This still does not satisfy Judge Douglas. He still adheres to his proposition, that I am re- sponsible for what some of my friends in differ- ent parts of the State have done; but that he is not responsible for what his have done. At least so I understand him. But in addition to that, the Judge at our. meeting in Cfalesburg, last week, undertakes to establish that I am guilty of a species of double-dealing with, the public that I make speeches of a certain sort in the North, among the Abolitionists, which I would not make in the South, and that I make speeches of a certain sort in the South which I would not make in the North. 1 apprehend in the course I have marked out for myself that I shall not have to dwell at very great length upon this subject. As this was done in the Judge's opening speech at Galesburgh, I had an opportunity, as I had the middle speech then, of saying something in answer to it. He brought forward a quotation or two from a speech of mine delivered at Chi- cago, and then to contrast with it he brought forward an extract from a speech of mine at Charleston, in which he insisted that I was greatly inconsistent, and insisted that his con- clusion followed that I was playing a double part, and speaking in one region one way and in another region another way. I have not time now to dwell on this as long as I would like, and I wish only now to re-quote that por- tion of my speech at Charleston which the Judge quoted, and

then make some comments upon it. This he quotes from me as being delivered at Charleston and I believe correctly ; / ' been, in favor of bringing about in any way " the social and political equality of the white " and black races that I am not nor ever have " been in favor of mailing voters or jurors of *' negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermingle with white people ; " and I will say in addition to this that there is *' a physical difference between the white and " black races which will ever forbid the two " races living together on terms of social and " political equality. And inasmuch as they | " cannot so live, while they do remain together - \ - /' - _ , < " then, there must be the position of superior. V' I A' ~ - f ^ ^ ^ ' ~ ^ " I am as much as any other man in favor of ' " having the superior position assigned to the "white race." "(ihood," "(nnd,V and iawd BheH)-ft-| This, I believe, is the entire quotation ^ fi-din the Charleston speech as the Judge made , it. His comments are as follows : " Yes, here you find men who hurrah for Lincoln. and say lie ib rkht wllh tio dlscax-da ail 'listinction between i rac<!,^ or when he (leclai-ei that he discards the doctrine that there is much a thing as a superior and inferior race; and Abolitionists are required and expected to vote for i ^// iyu^^U^^i^y^~^^~'-y^^ Mr. Lincoln because he goes for the equality rather than^es, he idins that in the Declaration of Independence the white man and the negro were desolated equal, and endowed by Divine iRW with equality. And down South with the Old Line 'Whies. with ^ Kentuckeians, the Virginians, and the Tennesseeans. he tells you that there is a physical difference between the races, mailing the one superior, the other inferior;'h and he is in favor of maintaining the superiority of the white race over the negro." Those are the Judge's comments9> So* I wish to show you, that a Ciohthy or only lacking three days of a month, bSiore I made the speech at Charleston, Vvhich the Judge quotes from, he had himself heard me say substantially the same thing. It was in our first meeting, '& Ottawa and I will say a word abfirt where it was and the atmosphere it was in, after, a while but, at our first greeting, at Ottawa, I read an extract from an old speech of mine, i, liade nearly four years ago, not merely to show my sentiments, but to show that my sentiments were long entertained and openly expressed; in which extract I expressly declared that my own feelings would not admit a social and political equality between the white and black races, and that even if my own feelings would admit of it, I still knew that the public sentiment of the country i^otiid not, and that such a thing was an utter impossibility, or substantially that. That extract from my old speech the reporters, by some sort of accident, passed over, and it was not reported* I lay no blame upon anybody. I suppose they thought that I would hand it over to them, and dropped reporting while I was reading it, but afterwards went away without it j;etting it from me. At the end of that quotation from my old speech, which I read at Ottawa, I made the comments which were reported at that time, and which I will now read, and ask you to notice how very nearly they are the same as Jftdfre Douglas says were delivered by me ^o'Srh in Egypt. After reading I added, these words: "Now, gentlemen, I " I don't want to read at any great length, but " this is the true appiiontwa of all I have ever " said in regard to the institution of slavery or " the black race, and this is the whole of it; and " anything that argues me into his idea of perfect social and political equality with the " negro is but a ^t^8*-ef fantastical

arrange- " ment of words by w'hich a man can prove a " horse-chestnut to be a chestnut horse. I will " say here, while upon this subject, that I have " no purpose directly or indirectly to'.interfere " with the institution in the States where it " it exists. I believe I have no right to do so. " I have no inclination to do so. I have no pur- " pose to introduce political and social equality " between the white and black races. There is a " physical difference bstwBeli the two, which, in "my judgment, will probably forever forbid " their living together on the footing of perfect " equality, and inasmuch as ii; becomes a neces- " sity that there must be Q diii'erence, I as well " as Judge Bouglas am in favor of the race to " which I belong having the superior position." tChears,,,"That's *he-doctrine." "I have "never said anything to the Bontrary. but I "hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is " no reason in the world why the negro is tot " entitled to all the rights enumerated In the " Declaration of Independence toe right of life, " liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I hold " that he is as much entitled to these as the "white man. I agree with Judge DoH.glas that " he is not my equal in many respects,' certain- " ly not in color perhaps not iu intellectual " and moral endowments j but la the right to " eat the bread without leave of anybody else " which his own hand earns, he is my equal and "the equal of Jud,jge Douurlasj ahd the equal of "sm^ other man." l,lilMi*.ohaaria. I have chiefly introduced this for the purpose of meeting the Judge's charire that the i*uota- tiou he took from my Charleston speech was what I would .say dovn south among the Ken- tuckians, the Virginians, Ac, but would not say in the regions in which was supposed to be more of the Abolition element. I now make this com- ment : That speech from which I have no* read the quotation, and which is there l?iven correctly, perhaps too much so for good taste, was made away up north in the Abolition district of this State^sr eoicellmce va. the Lovej'iy District in the personal presence of Lovejoy, for be was on the stand With us when I ^adrit. It had been made and put in print in that region Only three days less than a month before the speech made at Charleston, the like of which Judge Douglas thinks I would not make where there was any abolition eleinent. I only refer to this matter to Say that I am alto- gether unconscious of having attempted any double dealing anywhere that upon one occa- sion I may say one thing and leave other things unsaid, and sice iitrsa; bht that I have said anything on one occasion that is inconsistent with what I have said elsewhere, I deny at least I deny it so far as the intention is con- cerned. I find that I have devoted to this topic a larger portion of my time than I had -intended. I wished to show, but I will nass it uion tnis, m Ci'! % / /T'Vvo-^a^Cia Stmi^iit-

f- *S!^^^ occasion, that in the sentiment i have occasion- ally advanced upon the Declaration of Independ- ence. I am BntiT-nl-T hr.^_ ,,. !._ ^^'" _""=pcuu- ,,. 1 ence. I am entirely borne out by the sentfmeuls a A Vdvanced by om: old Whig leader, Henry Way \ \ anal havp tho >.Anb- >.,>.^ * u___ -, ,. -' ^\y 1 because I / I inteDde< r^ ave the book here to shoB' it from; but int. J A^" ^ ""^'^iy occupied more time than intended to do on that topic, I pass over it Scott Decision, pushed to its legitimate conse- quences, slavery vpould be established in all the btates as well as m the Territories.

I did this because upon a former occasion, I had asked Judge Douglas whether, if the Supreme Court should make a decision declaring that the States had not the power to exclude slavery from their limits, he would adhere to that decision as a rule of law, and whether he would follow that decision had he been a Justice of the Court; and because he had manifestly contented himself with sneering at the introduction of the question, and tried to show that no extension of the principle stated followed from the proposition already decided by the court. Judge Douglas had the privilege of replying to me at Galesburg, and again he gave me no direct answer as to whether he would or would not sustain such a decision if made. I wrote him this third chance to say yes or no. He is not obliged to do so; but if he replies, either by word or deed, I give him the third chance I tried to show then that this result this conclusion inevitably followed from the point already decided by the court. The Judge, in his reply, again sneers at the thought of the Court making any such decision, and in the course of his remarks upon this subject, uses the language, which I will now read. Speaking of me the Judge says: "He goes on and insists that the Dred Scott Decision would carry slavery into the free States, notwithstanding the decision itself says the contrary," And he adds? Mr. Lincoln knows that there is no member of the Supreme Court who holds that doctrine. And says that every one of them in their opinions held the reverse. I especially introduce this subject again for the purpose of saying that I have the Dred Scott Decision here, and I will thank Judge Douglas to lay his finger upon the place in the entire opinions of the court where any one of them "says the contrary." It is very hard to affirm, a negative without evidence. I say, however, that I have examined that decision with a good deal of care, as a lawyer examines a decision, and so far as I have been able to do so, the Court has nowhere in its opinions said that the States have the power to exclude slavery, nor have they used other language substantially that. I also say, so far as I can find, not one of the concurring Judges has said that the States can exclude slavery, nor said anything that was substantially that. The nearest approach that any one of them has made to it, so far as I can find, was by Judge Nelson, and the approach he made to it was exactly, in substance, the Nebraska Bill that the States had the exclusive power over the question of slavery, so far as they are not limited by the Constitution of the United States. I asked the question, therefore, if the non-concurring Judges, McLean or Chief Justice Curtis, had asked to get an express declaration that the States could absolutely exclude slavery from their limits, what reason have we to believe that it would not have been voted down by the majority of the Judges, just as Chase's amendment was voted down by Judge Douglas and his comrades when it was offered to the Nebraska Bill. Also at Galesburg, I said something in regard to those Springfield Resolutions that Judge Douglas had attempted to use upon me at Ottawa, and commented at some length upon the fact that they were, as presented, not genuine. Judge Douglas in his reply to me seemed to be somewhat exasperated. He said he would never have believed that Abraham Lincoln, as he kindly called me, would have attempted such a thing as I had attempted upon that occasion: and among other expressions which he used toward me, was that I dared to say forgery that I had dared to say forgery turning to Judge Douglas, yes. Judge, I did dare to say forgery. Yes.

^piiuMt:. Bat in this political canvass, the Judge ought to remember that I was not the first who dared to say forgery. At Jacksonville Judge Douglas made a speech in answer to something said by Judge TrumbuU, and at the close of what he said upon that sub- ject, he dared to say that TrumbuU had forged his evidence. He said, too, that he should not concern himself with TrumbuU any more, but theTcafter he should bold Lincoln responsible for the slanders upon him, isattt^itaM When I met him at Charleston after that, although J. think that I should not have noticed the subject if he had not said he would hold me responsible for it, I spread out before him the statements ot the evidence that Judge TrumbuU had used, and 1 asked Judge Douglas, piece by piece, to put his finger upon one piece of all that evi- dence that he would say was a forgery! When 1 went through with each and every piece. Judge Douglas did not dare then to say that any piece of it was a lorgery. 4<igiiter,-aad. ries of '<.gogtg09,4<"y So it seems that there are some things that judge Douglas dares to do, and some that he dares not to do^ ^tfiaat lainiliniiii iiml A Voice Its the same thing with you. Mr. Lincoln Yes, sir, it's the same thing with me. I do dare to say forgery, when its true, and I don't dare to say forgery when its false. 3'hiindiM-<it~ap{>ten8..-Ori8-t '^'^Hrt JuHinfte<ur'^^4i)4i(eit^to-iHi%^sLiscolW Now, I will say here to this audience and to Judge Douglas, I have not dared to say he committed a forgery, and I never shall until I know it; but I did dare to say-just to suggest to the Judge ^that a forgery had been committed, which by his own showing had been traced to him and' two of his friends. fttmr-{4aghtMi.>adijtta <>hmui'8j I dared to suggest to him that he had expressly promised in one ot his public speech- es to investigate that matter, and I dared to suggest to him that there was an implied prom- ise that when he investigated it he would make known the result, f dared to suggest to the Judge that he could not expect to be quite clear of suspicion of that fraud, for since the time tlnit i>rii!iiso wafi made he luid bi:i' . :i ; iieuus, and had not Kept his promise m regard to the investigation and the report upon it. yjSjl.4- laughter. v,jJlrie,..Dl,..l'Jiaud,_e^," ;itt*t-iiB.4ird." I am not a very daring mau, laa^kter'l hut I dared that much. Judge, and I am not much scared about it yet. IM | """"*^""~"-~"*^*^"- HMil i>i inltiit J When the Judge says he wouldn't have believed of Abraham Lincoln that he would have made such an attempt as that, he reminds me of the fact that he entered upon this canvass wilh the pur- pose to treat mfe courteously; that touched me somevyhat. aroifc>WWbhl W. It sets me tp thinking. I was aware, when it was first agreed that Judge Dougjas and I we)* to'liave these seven Joint dificcussioiis, that they were the succes- sive acts of a dramas perhaps I should say, to be enacted not merely in the face of audiences like this, but in the face of the nation, and to some extent, by my relation to him., and not from any- thing in myself, iil the face of the world; and t am anxious that they should be conducted with dignity and in the good teujper which would be befitting the vast andionce ljelore which it was con ducted i Bat wlien Judge Douglas got home from Washington and made his first speech in Chicago, the evniug afterwards I made some, sort of a re- ply to it. His second speech was made at J31oom- Ington, in which, he commented npdji my speech at Chicago;, and said that I had used langiage ingbiilously contrived to conceal my intentions, or words to that ett'eot. Now, I understand that this is an imputation upon my

Veracity and my candor. I do not know what the Judge understood by it; but in our first discussion at Ottawa, he led off by charging a bargain, somewhat corrupt in its character, up- on TrumbuU and myself that we, had entered into a bargain, one of the terms of Which was that Trumbftll *?,9 to aCioliionize the old Dem- ocratic party, and I (Lincoln) was to abolition- ize the old Whig party I pretending to be as good an Old Line Whig as ever. Judge Doug- las may not understand that he implicated my truthfulness and my hoijor, when he said I was doing one thing and pretending another; and I misunderstood him if he thought he was treat- ing me in a dignified way, as a man of honor and truth, as he now claims he was disposed to treat me. Even after that timej at Galesbur,^; when he brinsfs forwar! an eStract from "a speech made at Chicago, and an extract from a speech made at Charleston; to prove that I was trying to play a double part-that t was tryini^ to cheat the publioi and gSet votes Upon one set of principles at one place and upon another set of principles at another place Ido hot under- stand but what he impeaches my honor, my ve- racity and my candor, and because Ae (j,oes this, t do not understand that I ani bound, if I see a truthful grouhd for it, to keep my hands off of him. As .soon as I learned that Judge Douglas ,ai_djaiiagc(lto treat me in this way, I signified i one of m^^flfeches that I should 'be driven to draw upon vWatfeVei of humble resources I might nave to adopt a new course with him. I was not entirely sure that I should be able to hold my ' own with him, but I at least had the purpose I made to do as well as I eoild upon him; and now I say tfeat I will hot be the first to cry "hold." I think it originated with the Judge, and when he i quits, I probably wiU. B8SaiBt,talgEB3i'. But I shall not ask any favors at all. He asks Bie-, or I he asks the ^audienoB, if I wish t& push this mat- 1 fer to the point of personal difficulty. I teU him, } no. He dfd not make a mistake, in one of his early speeches, when be sailed me an " amiable" man, though perhaps he did when he called me an " inteUigent" man. HsgjgBtm.' It really hurts me very much to suppose that I have wronged anybody on earth. I again tell hiiw, nn 5 I very much prefer, when this Canjfass shall be : over, however it may result, tuat we at least part without any bitter recollections of peisonal diffi- 6ulties. , , , The Judge, in .his concluding speech at Gales- burg, says that I was pushing this matter to a i personal difliculty, to avoid the responsibility for the enormity of my principles. J. say to the Judge and to this andiense how, that I will again Statte olit- principles as well as I hastily can in all their enormity, and if the Judge here- after choose to confine himself to a war upon these principles, he will probablynot find me i departing from-it. ity"*' We have in this nation this elefthieft of do- / , mestic slavery. It is a matter of absolute cer- tainty that it is a disturbing element. It is the opinion of all the grejit men who hwe expressed an opinion upoh it, tliSt it is a dangerous ele- ment. We keep up a controversy in regard to it. That controversy necessarily springs from . difference of opinion, and if we can learn exact- ly can reduce to the lowest elements what that difference of opinion is, we perhaps shall be better prepared for discussing the dift'erent svs- tems of poUcy.thatwe frciildpropose in regard to that diBtUtbihg element. I suggest that the ditterence of opinion, reduced to its lowest terms, is no other than the difference between the men who think slavery a wrong and tKose who do not think it wrong. The Repi^bliiah party think it wrong

we think it is a moral, a social and a political wrong. We think it is a wrong not confining itself merely to the person or the states where it exists, but that it is a wrong in its tendency, to spread itself, that extends itself to the existence of the whole nation. Because we think it wrong, we propose a course of policy that shall deal with it as a wrong. We deal with it as with any other wrong, in so far as we can prevent its growing any larger, and so deal with it that in the run of time there may be some promise of an end to it. We have a due regard to the actual presence of it amongst us and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way, and all the constitutional obligations thrown about it. I suppose that is a reference both to its actual existence in the nation, and to our constitutional obligations, we have no right at all to disturb it; where it exists, we do profess that we have no more inclination to disturb it than we have the right to do it. We go further than that; we don't wish to disturb it.) 1 1 nA.'^

^ ^'#

We propose to disturb it where in time instance, we think the Constitution would permit us. We think the Constitution would permit us to disturb it in the District of Columbia. Still we do not propose to do that, unless it should be in terms which I don't suppose the nation is very likely soon to agree to the terms of making the emancipation gradual and compensating the unwilling owners. Where we suppose we have the constitutional right, we restrain ourself in reference to the actual existence of the institution and the difficulties thrown about it. We also oppose it as an evil so far as it seeks to spread itself. We insist on the policy that shall restrict it to its present limits. We don't suppose that in doing this we violate anything due to the actual presence of the institution, or anything due to the constitutional guarantees thrown around it. We oppose the Dred Scott decision in a certain way, upon which I ought perhaps to address you a few words. We do not propose that when Dred Scott has been decided to be a slave by the court, we, as a mob, will decide him to be free. We do not propose that, when any other one, or one thousand, shall be decided by that court to be slaves, we will in any violent way disturb the rights of property thus settled; but we nevertheless do oppose that decision as a political rule which shall be binding on the voter, to vote for nobody who thinks it wrong, which shall be binding on the members of Congress or the President to favor no measure that does not actually concur with the principles of that decision. We do not propose to be bound by it as a political rule in that way, because we think it lays the foundation not merely of enlarging and spreading out what we consider an evil, but it lays the foundation for spreading that evil into the States themselves. We propose so resisting it as to have it reversed if we can, and a new judicial rule established upon this subject. I will add this, that if there be any man who does not believe that slavery is wrong in these three aspects which I have mentioned, or in any one of them, that man is misplaced, and ought to leave us. While, on the other hand, if

there be any man in the Republican party who is im- patient over the necessity springing from its actual presence, and is impatient of the consti- tutional guarantees thrown around it, apd would act in disregard of these, he too is misplaced Standing with us. He will And his place some- where else; for we have a due regard, so far as we are capable of understanding them, for afP these thin^ This, gentlemen, as well as 1 canj give it, is a plain statement ol^ our principles in all their enormity. ', 1 will say now that there is a sentiment in the^; country contrary to me a sentiment whieh^ holds that slavery is not wrong, and therefore ' it goes for policy that does not propose dealing with it as a wrong. That policy is the Democrat-, ic policy, and that sentiment is the Democratic sentiment. If there be a doubt in the mind of any one of this vast audie>-ce that this is really the central idea of the Democratic party, in re- lation to this sitbject, I ask him to bear with me while I state a few things, tending, as I think, to prove that proposition. In the first place, the leading man 1 think I may do my friend Judge L>ouglas the honor of calling him such advocating the present Democratic poli- cy, never himself says it is wrong. He has the high distinction, so tar as I know, of never hav- ing said slavery is either right or wrong. iiii| i>iilar Almost everybody else says one or the other, but the Judge never does. If there be a man iu the Democratic party who thinks it is wrong, and yet chugs to that party, I suggest to him iu the hrst place that his leader don't talk as he does, for he never says that it is wrong. In the second place, I suggest to him that if he will examine the policy proDosed to be carried forward, he will find that he carefully excludes the idea that there is anything wrong in it. If you will examine the arguments that are made iit, you will find that every one carefully ex- cliides the idea that there is anything wrong in slavery. Perhaps that Democrat who says he is as much opposed to slavery as 1 am, will tell me that I am wrong about this. I wish him to examine his own course in regard to this mat- ter a moment, and then see if his opinion will not be changed a little. You say it is wrong ; but don't you constantly object to anybody else saying so ? Do you not constantly argue that this is not the right place to oppose it? You say it must not be opposed in the free States, because slavery is not here; it must not be op- posed in the slave States, because it is there; it must not be opposed in politics, because that will make a fuss; it must not be opposed in the pulpit, because it is not religion. Lftud thgf Then where is the place to oppose it ? There is no suitable place to oppose it. There is no plan in the country to oppose this evil ovespreading the continent, which you say yourself is coming. . Frank Blair and Gratz , Brown tried to get up a system of gradual emancipation in Missouri, had an election iu August and got beat, and you, Mr. Democrat, threw up your hat, and halloed " hurrah foe Democracy." ftnUlimnnmrTihainn So 1 say again that in regard to the arguments that are made, when Judge Douglas says he " don't caro whether slavery is voted up or voted down,"; whether he means that as an individual expres- wrong, he cannot logically say that anybody has a right to do Wrong. When he says that slave property and horsB and hog property are alike t6 bs allowed to go into the Territories, upon the principles of equality, he ia reasoning truly, if there is no difference between them as prop- erty; but if the one is property, held rightfully, and the other is wrong) then there is no equal- ity bistween the right anti wrong; so that,

turn it in any way you may, in all the arguments sustaining the democratic policy, and in that policy itself, there is a careful, studied exclusion of the idea that there is anything wrong in slavery. Let us understand this. I am anxious to prove that we are right and they are wrong. I have been stating where we and they stand, and trying to show what is the real difference between us and I now say that whenever we can get the question distinctly stated can get all these men who believe that slavery is in some of the respects wrong, to stand and act with us in treating it as a wrong then, and not till then, I think we will in some way come to an end of this slavery agitation, sir. (Vocal reaction) SKVATOE DOUGLAS' REPLY. Mr. Douglas, with tremendous applause. QAWL: Ladies and Gentlemen: Permit me to say that unless silence is observed it will be impossible for me to be heard by this immense crowd, and my friends can confer no higher favor upon me than by omitting all expressions of applause or approbation. I desire to be heard rather than to be applauded. I wish to address myself to your reason, your judgment, your sense of justice, and not to your passions. I regret that Mr. Lincoln should have deemed it proper for him to again indulge in gross personalities and base insinuations in regard to the Springfield resolutions. It has imposed upon me the necessity of using some portion of my time for the purpose of calling your attention to the facts of the case, and it will then be for you to say what you think of a man who can predicate such a charge upon the circumstances he has this. I had seen the platform adopted by a Republican Congressional convention held in Aurora, the second Congressional district, in September, 1854. published as purported to be the platform of the Republican party, that platform declared that the Republican party was pledged never to admit another slave State into the Union, and also that it pledged to prohibit slavery in all the territories of the United States, not only all that we then had, but all that we should thereafter acquire, and to repeal unconditionally the fugitive slave law, abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and prohibit the slave trade between the different States. These and other articles against slavery were contained in this platform, and unanimously adopted by the Republican Congressional convention in that district. I had also seen the Republican Congressional conventions at Rockford, in the first district, and at Bloomington, in the third, had adopted the same platform that year, nearly word for word, and had declared it to be the platform of the Republican party. I had noticed that Major Thomas L. Harris a member of Congress from the Springfield district had referred to that platform in a speech in Congress as having been adopted by the first Republican State Convention which assembled in Illinois. When I had occasion to use the fact in this canvass I wrote to Major Harris to know on what day that convention was held, and to ask him to send me its proceedings. He being sick, Charles H. Lanphere answered my letter by sending me the published proceedings of the convention held at Springfield on the 5th of October, 1854, as they appeared in the report of the State Register. I read those resolutions from that newspaper the same as any of you would refer back and quote any fact from the files of a newspaper which had published it. Mr. Lincoln pretends that after I had so quoted those resolutions he discovered that they had never been adopted at



Springfield. He does not deny their , afioption by the Republican party at Aurora at t Bloomington, and at Rocktord, aud by nearly'all i ^,? Hephublican county conventio^js in northern Illinois where his party is in a majority, but merely because they were not adopted on the "sBoi!"on which I said they were, he chooses to quibble about the place rather than meet and discuss the merits of the resolutions themselves. I stated when I quo- ted them that I did so from the State Hegister. I gave my authority. Lincoln believed at the time, as he has since admitted, that they had been adopted at Spring- held, as published. Does he believe now, that I did not tell the truth when 1 quoted those resolutions ? He knows, in his heart, that I quoted them in good faith, believing, at the time, that they had been adopted a, Springfield. I would consider myself ,an infamous wretch, if, under such circumstances I could charge any man with being a party to a trick or a fraud.- (q;iii<(ipteULm) And I will tell him, too, that It will not do to charge a forgery on Charles H. Lanphere or Thomas L. Harris No fnan on earth, who knows them, and knows Lincoln would take his oath against their word (tthuM 1 There are not two men in the State of Illinois who have higher characters for truth, for integrity for moral character, aud for elevation of tone as gen- tlemen, than Mr. Lanphere and Mr. Harris Any jnan who attempts to make such charges as Mr Lincoln has indulged in against them, only pro- claims himself a slanderer. (\aoifijiroajt*pBlaiae) I I will now show you that I stated with entire airness, as soon as it was made known to me that there was a mistake about tiie spot where the'rcso ston of his of sentiment, or only as a sort of Statement mwoos had been adopted, although their truthfui- 3 views on national policy, it is alike true, "";?f, ' *f " declaration of the principles of the Re- publican patty had not, andcould not be quea- don't see anything wrong in it; but he can-i """"^Z . u,?,,,,, """" ""i'Incoln to point out tho logically if he admits that """"ake; but the moment discovered it, I made a He cannot say that fp^h, and published it to the world, correcting I corrected it myself, as a gentleman to say that he can thus argue logically if he e anything wrong in it; but he can- r SO logically if he admits that is wrong. He cannot say that uld as soon sea a wrong votfd """"%""; ' * """"o>- ^'=u ,i myseii, as a gentleman, voted down. When Judge "Douglas S^ll" ^A"f' "'r'/'""* "' ' , """"^1^ f^' ? '><i " siysthat whoever, or whatever community, coinooSwshlwZf.?"""""";/ ""?" ^'-^^"- wants sl-aves, they have a right to have them, oes/and trmhfuln.L ^h ^'^f^vith equal fair- he is perfectly logical if there is nothing wrong hf'V". ' l'u'!" -""?" ^ "5.1" convinced not say slavery he would up the error. he is perfectly logical if there is nothing wrong hrm'tharhpTa,""hpr*" ia the iastitation i bat if you admit that it ia p*^^^'^^ '^^ mistaken. ^ir-feMB-amkia I will give you an illustration to show ^rijltife. rg^V

4iM ..d

jmmtm *^^*'-#t?S; you how he acts lu a similar case : In a sneech at Sprmgfield he charged Uh.ef Justice Tane^aud his associates, President Pierce, President Bu ohanan, and myself, w.th having entered into a con- spiracy at the time the Nebraska^Mll was introduced by which the Dred Scott decision was to be made by the Supreme Court, in order to carry slavery everywhere under the

constitution. I called his attention to the fact, that at the time alluded to to wit; the introduction of the Nebraska bill, it was not possible that such a conspiracy could have been hatched. I told him that the Scott case had never been taken before the Supreme Court and was not taken before it for a year after and I asked him to take back that charge. Did he do it? Well- I showed him that it was impossible that the fact could be in the record, and I then called upon him to retract his false charge. What was his answer? Instead of coming out as an honest man and doing so, he reiterated the charge, and said that if the case had not gone up to the Supreme Court from the courts of Missouri at the time he charged that the Judges of the Supreme Court entered into the conspiracy, yet, that there was an understanding with the Democratic owners of Dred Scott, that they would take it up. I have since asked him who the Democratic owners of Dred Scott were, but he could not tell, and why? Because there were no Michigan Democratic owners in existence. Dred Scott at the time was owned by the Rev. Dr. Chaffee, an Abolition member of Congress, of Springfield, Massachusetts, in right of his wife, she was owned by one of Lincoln's friends and not by Democrats at all; his case was conducted in court by Abolition lawyers, so that both the prosecution and the defense were in the hands of the Abolition political friends of Mr. Lincoln. Notwithstanding thus proved by the record that his charge against the Supreme Court was false, instead of taking it back he resorted to another false charge to sustain the infamy of it. He also charged President Buchanan with having been a party to the conspiracy. I directed his attention to the fact that the charge could not possibly be true, for the reason that at the time specified, Mr. Buchanan was not in America, but was three thousand miles off, representing the United States at the Court of St. James, and had been there for a year previous, and did not return until three years afterwards. Yet I never could get Mr. Lincoln to take back his false charge although I have called upon him over and over again. He refuses to do it, and either remains silent, or, resorts to other tricks to try and palm his slander off on the country. Therein you will find the difference between Mr. Lincoln and myself. When I made a mistake, as an honest man I correct it; without being asked to do so, but when he makes a false charge he sticks to it, and never corrects it. I quote him at Ottawa merely to ask Mr. Lincoln whether he stood on that platform. That was the purpose for which I quoted them. I did not think that I had a right to put idle questions to him, and I first laid a foundation for my questions by showing that the principles which I wished him either to affirm or deny had been adopted by some portion of his friends, at least as their creed. Hence I read the resolutions, and put the questions to him, and he then refused to answer them. Subsequently, one week afterwards, he did answer a part of them, but the others he has not answered up to this day. I said to him, "You cannot say, 'I never can,' and believe me, if you are my friends, you will believe, 'I cannot say.'"

Now, let me call your attention for a moment to the answers which Mr. Lincoln made at Freeport to the questions which I propounded him at Ottawa, based upon the platform adopted by a majority

of the Abolition counties of the State, which now as then 8up | 'Orted him. In answer to my question whether he endorsed the Black Kepublican princi- ple of " no more slave States," he answered that he was not pledged agamst the admission of any more slave States, but that he would.be v. ry sorry if he should ever be placed in a position where he would have to vote on the question ; that he would rejoice to know that no more slave States would be admit- ted into the Union ; " but," he added, " if slavery shall be kept out of the territories during the terri torial existence of any one given territory, and then the people shall, having a fair chance and a clear fiedld when they come to adopt the constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a slave constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence ot the institution among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union." The point I wish him to answer is this: Suppose Congress should not prohibit slavery in the territory, and it applied for admis- sion with a constitution recognizing slave- ry, then how would he vote? His answer at Freeport does not apply to any ter- ritory in America. I ask you, (turning to Lincoln,) will you vote to admit Kansas into the Union, with just such a constitution as her people want, with slavery or without as they shall determine ? He will not answer, .^o'g 'aftwjif iiiiii oboaiHi.) I have put that question to hira time and time again, and . have not been able to get an answer out of him. I ask you again, Lincoln, will you vote to admit New Mexico whensbe has the requisite population with such a constitution as her people adopt, either re- cognizing slavery or not as they shall determine ? He will not answer. I put the same question to him m reference to Oregon and the new States to be carved out of Texas, in pursuance of the contract between Texas and the United States, and he will not answer. He will not answer these questio s in reference to any territory now in existence ; but says, that if Congress should prohibit slavery in a . territory, and when hi people asked for admission as a State, they should adopt slavery as one of their institutions, that he supposes he would have to let it come in. (*BfWm) I submit to you whether that answer of his to my question does not justify me in saying that he has a fertile genius in devis- ing language to conceal his thoughts. (iJUwd foi yon, gU'i'i'ati "to" Dou^lftB,-Ac.) I ask you whether there is an intelUgenf man in America who does not believe, that that answer was made for the pur- pose 01 concealing what he intended to do. ^WO, _UU/mi^uhinrB.) He wished to make the old line Whigs believe that he would stand by the compro mise measures of 1850, which declared that the States might come into the Union with slavery, or without as they pleased, while Lovejoy and his abolition allies up North, explained to the abolitionists, that in taking this ground he preached good abolition doc- trine, because his proviso would not apply to any territory in America, and therefore there was no chance of his being governed by it. It would have been quite t asy for him to have said, that he would let the people of a State do j ast as they pleased, if he desired to convey such an idea. Why did he not do it ? (li wftmaifrwirt to) He would not answer my question directly, because up North, the abolition creed declares that tiere shall be no more slave States, while down south in Adams ooiinty, in Coles, and in Saugamon, he and his friends are afraid to ad vance that doctrine. Therefore, he gives an evasive and equivocal answer, to be construed one way in ' the south and another way in the north, which,

when analyzed, it is apparent is not an answer at all with reference to any territory now in existence. (" Hit liij-^tho-wnnUy gjrtfi/", "HnrrnVi (nr nirn^ Mr. Lincoln complains that, in my speech the other day at Galesburg, I read an extract from a speech delivered by him at Chicago, and then an- other from his speech at Charleston, and compared them, thus showing the people that he had one set of principles in one part of the State and another in the other part. And how does he answer that charge? Why, he quotes from his Charleston speech as 1 quoted from it, and then quotes another extract from a speech which he made at another place, which he says is the same as the extract from his speech at Charleston ; but he does not quote the extract from his Chicago speech, upon which I con- victed him of double dealing. (QkiMMi.) I quoted from his Chicago speech to prove that he held one set of principles up north among the abolitionists, and from his Charleston speech to prove that he held another set down at Charleston and la south- ern Illinois. In his answer to this charge, he ignores entirely his Chicago speech, and merely argues that he said the same thing which he said at at Charleston at another place. If he did, it fol- lows that he has twice, instead of oace, held one creed in one part of the State and a different creed in another part. (tta'Mmitigetontof it,-:,a;a<l'eh9w.). Up at Chicago, in the opening of the campaign, he reviewed my reception speech, and undertook to answer my argument attacking his favorite doc- trine ot negro equality. I had shown that it was a falsification of the Declaration of Independence to pretend that that instrument applied to .and includ- ed negroes in the clause declaring that all men were created equal. What was Lincoln's reply. I will read f-^om his Chicago speech, and the one which he did not quote, and dare not quote, in this part of the State. (liGutlj;" <*titm'^4iaar>"Ac.) He said: "I should like to know. If taking this old Declaration of In- dependence, whiob deolarts that all men are eautC upon prln- ?^ olple. and making except'ons to it, where wLU It'mnn 9 ri one man says ,t does not mean a nW'o, why may not aLth tod it and teS- i oSt !"* " " *"""" " " " " "o"" """" ^ There you find that Mr. Lincoln told the aboli- tionists of Chicago that if the Declaration of Inde- pendence did not declare that the negro was created by the Almighty the equal of the*^ white man, that you ought to take that instrument and tear out the clause which says that all men were created equal. (.:iMmr;k.4,^,>glu,") But let me call your attention to another part of the same speech, you know that mhis Charleston speech, an extract from which he has read, he declared that the negro belongs to an inferior race; is physically inferior to the white man, and should always be kept in an inferior position. I will now read to you what he said at Chicago on that point. In conoludina his speech at that place, he remarked: t'^^^J'^A?'^" I ha e detained you about as long as I desire S?i thi if ,*""I '^" other man -this race md that race piace a in au it;lorldor pos!tioL>, d scardine our standard that S u'L &V'iS"&','f"" *""* "">" " ^ *il o^ce more si&na up aeclarmg that hU men are created eeual " Thus you see, that when addressing the Chioaeo abolitionists he declared that all distinctions of race must be discarded and blotted out, because the netro stood on an equal footing with the white man ; that if one man said the Declaration of Independence did not mean a negro when it declared all men cre- ated equal, that another man would say that it did not mean another man; and hence we ought to dis- card all difference between

the negro race and all other races, and declare them all created equal Did old Gidduigs, when he came down among you four years ago, preach more radical abolitionism than that? (iMafjs^ak") Did Lovejoy, or Lloyd Garrison, or Wendell Phillips, or Fred Douglass ever take higher abolition grounds than that? Lin-coln told you that I had charged him with getting up these personal attacks to conceal the enormity of his principles, and then commenced talking about something else, omitting to quote this part of his Chicago speech which contained the enormity of his principles to which I alluded. He knew that I alluded to his negro-equality doctrines when I spoke of the enormity of his principles, yet he did not find it convenient to answer on that point. Having shown you what he said in his Chicago speech in reference to negroes being created equal to white men and about discarding all distinctions between the two races, I will again read to you what he said at Charleston: .f'^-.^'i!' s^y^tK". 'hat I am not nor ever have been in favor of briuginijaboutin anyway, the social and political equality SL *'f 'j'""""t'* back races: that I am not nor ever have been in favor of mjking voters of ;he free negroes, orjurSrs or ualifjng them to ho d offee, or having tliem to marry ^i^iii;;'i'i'HiK""""v^ "" ^i' in. addition, tnat there is a pliyslcal dUference between the white and black racss. which. I suppose. Will for ever forbid the two races living tog "theJ SfKe'ro^ |;i>riot^i."1n7^fo^t'gir^/^^ aLUed'?o"thr41t^ 'jnT' " ^ "^^ ^'^>^" --"" ^^^ A VoiCE-^'I'hat's the doctrine// Mb. Douglas Yes, sir, that is good doctrine, but Mr. Lincoln is afraid to advocate it in the latitude SL_ft*! """"^ ^^ ""p"" "" K<*' h's votes. (irmaa.) It IS good doctrine in the anti-abolition counties for him, and his Chicago speech is good doctrine m the abolition counties. I assert, on the authority of these two speeches of Mr. Lincoln that he hold' one set of principles in the abolition counties, and a different and contradictory set in the other counties (" That's sn,"^ aad-eh<Mir) 1 i;4lu'

I^sf^, 1

/.

i do not question that he said at Ottawa what he quo- ted, but that only convicts him further, by proving that he has twice contradicted himself instead of once. {"SimaU>ai^fi^mie.) Let me ask hi:a why he cannot avow his principles the same in the North as in the South tne same in every county, if he has a conviction that they are just? But I forgot he would not be a Republican if his princi- ples would apply alike to every part of the country. The party to which he belongs is bounded and limit ed by geographical lines. Witli their principles they cannot even cross the Mississippi river on your ferry boats. (ljpmen.^ .^pi^oiie.) They cannot cross over the OliioTnto Kentucky. Lincoln him- self cannot visit the land ol his fathers, the scenes ^of his childhood, the graves of his ancestors, and carry his abolition principles, as he declared them "at Chicago, with him. (*'Hi4 bH'^gai!!a^--^..^ii This Republican organization appeals to the North against the Soutn; it appeals to northern passion, uortueru prejudice, and northern ambi- tion, against southern people,



southern States, and southern institutions, and its only hope of success is by that appeal, Mr. Lincoln goes on to justify himself in making war upon slavery, upon the ground that Breckinridge and Gratz Brown did not succumb in their warfare upon the institutions, in Missouri. (Littell's Living Age) Frank Blair was elected to Congress in 1856, from the State of Missouri as a Buchanan Democrat, and he turned Freimont after the people elected him, thus belonging to one party before his election, and another afterwards, (Littell's Living Age) What right then had he to expect, after having thus cheated his constituency, that they would support him at another election. (Littell's Living Age) Mr. Lincoln thinks that it is his duty to preach a crusade in the free States, against slavery, because it is a crime, as he believes, and ought to be extinguished; and because the people of the slave States will never abolish it. How is he going to abolish it? Down in the southern part of the State he takes the ground openly that he will not interfere with slavery where it exists, and says that he is not now and never was in favor of interfering with slavery where it exists in the States. Well, if he is not in favor of that, how does he expect to bring slavery in a course of ultimate extinction? ("Littell's Living Age") How can he extinguish it in Kentucky, in Virginia, in all the slave States by his policy, if he will not pursue a policy which will interfere with it in the States where it exists? (Littell's Living Age) In his speech at Springfield before the Abolition or Republican convention, he declared his hostility to any more slave States in this language: "Under the operation of that policy the agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved. I do not expect the house to fall but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or, its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States old as well as new, North as well as South." Mr. Lincoln there told his Abolition friends that this government could not endure permanently, divided into free and slave States as our fathers made it, and that it must become all free or all slave, otherwise, that the government could not exist. How then does Lincoln propose to save the Union, unless by compelling all the States to become free, so that the house shall not be divided against itself. He intends making them all free; he will preserve the Union in that way, and yet, he is not going to interfere with slavery anywhere it now exists. How is he going to bring it about? Why, he will agitate, he will induce the North to agitate until the South shall be worried out, and forced to abolish slavery. Let us examine the policy by which it is to be done, he first tells you that he would prohibit slavery everywhere in the territories. He would thus confine slavery within its present limits. When he thus gets it confined, and surrounded, so that it cannot spread, the natural laws of increase will go on until the negroes will be so plenty that they cannot live on the soil. He will hem them in until starvation seizes them, and by starving them to death, he will put slavery in the course of ultimate extinction. If he is not going to interfere with

slavery in the States, but intends to interfere and prohibit it in the territories, and thus smother slavery out, it naturally follows, that he can extinguish it only by extinguishing the negro race, for his policy would drive them to starvation. This is the humane and Christian remedy that he proposes for the great crime of slavery. He tells you that I will not argue the question whether slavery is right or wrong. I tell you why I will not do it. I hold that under the Constitution of the United States, each State of this Union has a right to do as it pleases on the subject of slavery. In Illinois we have exercised that sovereign right by prohibiting slavery within our own limits. I approve of that line of policy. We have performed our whole duty in Illinois. We have gone as far as we have a right to go under the constitution of our common country. It is none of our business whether slavery exists in Missouri or not. Missouri is a sovereign State of this Union, and has the same right to decide the slavery question for herself that Illinois has to decide it for herself. (Good.) Hence I do not choose to occupy the time allotted to me in discussing a question that we have no right to act upon. (I get*) I thought that you desired to hear us upon the questions coming within our constitutional power of action. Lincoln will not discuss these. What question has he discussed that comes within the power or calls for the action or interference of an United States Senator? He is going to discuss the rightfulness of slavery when Congress cannot act upon it either way. He wishes to discuss the merits of the Dred Scott decision when under the constitution, a Senator has no right to interfere with the decision of judicial tribunals. He wants your exclusive attention to two questions that he has no power to act upon; to two questions that he could not vote upon if he was in Congress, to two questions that are not practical, in order to conceal your attention from other questions which he might be required to vote upon should he ever become a member of Congress. He tells you that he does not like the Dred Scott decision. Suppose he does not, now is he going to help himself? He says that he will reverse it. How will he reverse it? I know of but one mode of reversing judicial decisions, and that is by appealing from the inferior to the supreme court. But I have never yet learned how or where an appeal could be taken from the Supreme Court of the United States! The Dred Scott decision was pronounced by the highest tribunal on earth. From that decision there is no appeal this side of Heaven. Yet, Mr. Lincoln says he is going to reverse that decision. By what tribunal will he reverse it? Will he appeal to a mob? Does he intend to appeal to violence, to Lynch law? Will he

appeal to violence, to stir up strife and rebellion in the land and overthrow the court by violence? He does not deign to tell you how he will reverse the Dred Scott decision, but keeps appealing each day from the Supreme Court of the United States to political meetings in the country, (to a gathering.) He wants me to argue with you the merits of each point of that decision before this political meeting. I say to you, 'with all due respect, that I choose to abide by the decisions of the Supreme Court as they are pronounced. It is not for me to inquire after a decision is made whether I like it in all the points or not. When I used to practice law with Lincoln, I never knew him

to be beat in a cas; that he did not get mad at the judge and talk about appealing; (laugh- ter,) and when 1 got, beat 1 generally thought the court was wrong, bnt I never dreamed ot going out of the court house and making a stump speech to the people against the judge, merely because I had found out that I did not know the law as well as be did. (Ctmliti'taufehiimi.) If the decision did not suit me, 1 appealed until 1 got to the Supreme Court, and then if that court, the highest tribunal in the world decided against me, I was satisfied, because it is the duty of every law abiding man to obey the constitutions, the laws, and the constituted author- ities. He who attempts to stir up odium and rebel- lion in the country against the constituted authori- ties, is stimulating the passions of men resort to vio- lence and to mobs instead of to the law. Hence, 1 tell you that I take the decisions of the Supreme Court as iha law of the land, and I intend to obey them as such But, Mr. Lincoln says that 1 will not answer his question as to what I would do in the event of the court making so ridiculous a decision as he ima- gines they would by deciding that the 1fee State of Illinois could uot prohibit slavery within her own limits. I told him at Freeport why 1 would not answer such a question. I told him that tlj^re was not a man possessing any brains in America, lawyer or not, who ever dreamed thai such a thing could JhA"*',,,?!***^>L^AM' tten, as I gay now that by al the principles set forth in the Dred SooU now""tha;'i' P'!^ * ""-I "" then, as I do now, that It IS an mOTtf/to men's understanding advann^jr*"?."""""^ - ^^ <="" . ^ presume fn ffoi ???! decision known to be in direct viola- tion of the constitution. Drtd ^^ohT^"? ^T^ ""K was said about the Dred Scott decision before it passed. did the same thmg m reference to the Dred Scott The',irin^i'^ "f^^^j' ^ *^^ '^^at way bef^e had ger?ffi^""5'""*'^- * * J^'-^l Scott decision HK? nf w^T"" PW "8 y in various other de- cisions. What court or judge ever held that a ne- haddeciLSTf- ^9bt?r.) The State courts had decided that question over and over again, and the Dred Scott decision on that point only aflimed what every court m the land knew to be the law But I will not be drawn o2 into an argument upon the merits of the Dred Scott decision^ Tt8 enough for me to know that the Constitution of the United States created the Supreme Court for the purpose of deciding all disputed questions touching the true construction of that msfciument, and when such decisions are pronounced, they are the law of the land, binding on every good citizen. Mr. Lin- coln has a very convenient mode of arguing upon the subjec.. He.holds that because he is a Sepub hoan that he IS not bound by the decisions oAhe Court bnt that I being a Democrat am so bound (Jji*terad.ebei.) It may be that Republicans do not bold themselfe-s bound by the laws of the land and the Constitution of the country as ex- pounded by the courts; it may be an article in the Kepublioan creed that men who do not like a de oiaion, have a right to rebel against it; but when Mr Lincoln preaches that doctrine, I think be will find some honest Republican-some law-abidina man in that party who will repudiate such a mon- sirous doctrine. The decision in the Dred Scott case IS binoing on every American citizen alike; and yet Mr. Lincoln argues that the Republicans are not bound by it, because they are opposed to it, te>W,) whilst Democrats are bound by it, be- cause we will not resist it. A Democrat cannot re- ?^?LI, constituted authorities of this country. I*.) A Democrat is a law-abiding man, a Dem- ocrat stands by the XJonstitution and



the laws, and relies upon liberty as protected by law, and not upon mob or political violence. I have never yet been able to make Mr. Lincoln understand, or can I make any man who is deter- mined to support him, right or wrong, understand how it IS that under the Dred Scott decision the people of a Territory, as well as a State, can have slavery or not, just as they please. I believe that I can explain that proposition to all constitution-loving law-abiding men in a way that they cannot fail to uuaerstand it Chief Justice Taney, in his opinion m the Dred Scott case, said that slaves being prop- erty, the owner of them has a right to tak? them into a territory the same as he would any other property; in other words, that slave property, so far as the right to enter a territory is concerned stands on the same footing with other property' Suppose we grant that proposition. Then anf man has a right to go to Kansas and take his property with him, but when he gets there he must rely upon mav he '?.^ *". P'-tot his property, whatever it may oe. (J/Hut'imsui) In order to illustrate this imagine that three of you conclude to go to Kan- lfn r,oo^ 'lr l^*"<' ^^^^ ot slaves, another wm-ihnfT of liquors, and the third \$10,000 worth of dry goods. When the man who owns the dry goods arrives ou- there and commences selling them, he finds that he is stopped and prohibited lrvlll'K^ ""'i' ^t ^""^ ^ """"^*. "l^jo" will de stroy althe profits he can make on his goods to pay for When the man wiith the liquors gets there and tries to sell he finds a Maine liquor law in iorce which prevents him. Now, of what use is his f: 4

I H li ' I M '1

!4M^j>fLiL^MH i>K--fv tPofIV?n*, "h""^"" *"" Propofy unless he is pro- "lere . ^*o*s~*;^ fhe man who goes there with his slaves finds that there is no in^IP!."^?V!"!." "" * ""^"S there. He has IL' ,L K * " /H"" ""^<" P"" regulations, the territory just as effectually and as positively as a constitutional prohibition could. """"""^y "" / ^"5^ "? ** understanding when the Kansas JAnd Nebraska bill was pending^in Congress. Real he speech of Speaker Orr, ot South Carolina, ,n the House of Representatives, in 1866, on the Kan- sas question, and you will find that he takes the ground that while the owner of a slave has a right to go into a territory, and carry his slaves with him that he cannot hold them one day or hour unless there is a slave code to protect him. He tells you that slavery would not exist a day in South Oaro- r^I,J *7 ""> St^s, unless there was a friendly people and friendly legislation. Read the speeches of that giant in intellect, Alexander H. Stephens, of (xeorgia, and you will find them to the same effect Kead the speecnos of Sam Smith, of Tennessee, and ot all Southern men, and you will find that they all understood this doctrine then as we understand it now. Mr. Lincoln cannot be made to understand it however. Down at Jonesboro, he went on to argue that It be the law that a man has a right to take his slaves into territory of the United States under the constitution, that then a member of Congress was perjured it he did not vote for a slave code I ask him whether the decision of the Supreme Court IS not binding upon him as well as on me ? If so and he holds that he would be perjured if he did not vote for a slave code under it, I ask

him whether, if elected to Congress, he will so vote' I have a right to his answer, and I will tell you why He put that question to me down ;n Egypt, and did It with an air ot triumph. This was about the form otit: In the event Ota slaveholding citizen of one ot the territories should need and demand a slave code to protect his slaves, will you vote for it'" I answered him that a fundamental article in the Democratic creed, as put forth in the IVebraska bill and the Cincinnati platforn, was non intervention by Congress with slavery in the States and territo- and hence, that I would not vote in Congress for any code ot laws either tor or against slavery in any territory. I will leave the people perfectly free to decide that question for themselves. ^MIHIMk) Mr. Lincoln and the Washington Unioti both think this a monstrous bad doctrine. Neither Mr. Lincoln or the Washington Union, like my Freeport speech on that subject. The Union., in a late num- ber, has been reading me out of the Democrat c party because I hold that the people ot a territory, like those of a State, have the right to have slavery or not, as they please. It has devoted three and a half columns to prove certain propositions, one of which I will read. It says: "'^L?, """"""!?" "" ^^^ *"""" Jndge Douglas'action In 1860 and 1854 was taken with especial reference to the announce- ""?" ""^v. ""?"", ""* ^?^ programme which was made at Ifree- port. The declaration at Freeport was. that In his opinioa the people can. by lawful means, exclude slavery from a ter- ritory before it comes in as a State;' and he declared that Ws competitor oad h ard hun aigue the Nebraska bi',1 on that ptiDolple all over IUinols :n 1S64,1855. and 1836, and had no excuse to pret end to have any doubt upon that subject" The Washington Union there charges me with the monstrous crime of now proclaiming on the stump the same doctrine that I carried out in 1860, by supporting Clay's compromise measures. The Union also charges that I am now proclaiming the same doctrine that I did in 18Si in support of the Kansas' and Nebraska bill. It is shocked that I should now stand where I stood in 1850, when I was supported by Clay, Webster, Cass and the great men of that day, and where I stood in 1864, and in 1856, when Mr. Buchanan was elected Presi- dent. It goes on to prove and succeeds in proving from my speeches in Congress ou Clay's compro- mise measures, that I held the same doctrines at that time that I do now, and then proves that by the Kansas and Nebraska bill I advanced the same doctrine that I now advance. It remarks : "So much for the course taken by Judge Douriaa on th compromises of 1850. The record shows, beyond the possi- bility of cavil or dispute, that he expressly intended in those bills to give the territorial legislatures power to exclude slaver;?. How stands his record in the memorable session of 1854 with reference ti> the Kansas-Nebraska bill itself? We shall rot overhaul the votes that were given on that notab'e measure. Our space will not afford It. We have his own words, however, delivered in his speech closing the great debate on that bill on the night of March 3,1854. to show th>tt he mtant to do in 1854 precisely what h.e ha<l mea/nt to do in 1858. The Kansas-Nebraska bill be.ngupon its passage, he said: It then quotes my remarks upon the passage of the bill as follows: "The principle which we propose to carry into effect by this bill is this: That Congress shall neither legislate slavery into any Territory or-tate nor out of the same; but the people shall be lei't free to regulate their domestic concerns in th'^ir own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United

States. In order to carry this principle into practical operation, it becomes necessary to remove whatever legal obstacles might be found in the way of its free exercise. It is only for the purpose of carrying out this great fundamental principle of self-government that the bill renders the eighth section of the Missouri act inoperative and void. " Now, let me ask, will those Senators who have arraigned me, or any one of them, have the assurance to rise in his place and declare that this great principle was never thought of or advocated as applicable to territorial bills in 1850; that, from that session until the present, nobody ever thought of incorporating this principle in all new territorial organizations, &c., &c. I will begin with the compromises of 1850. Any Senator who will take the trouble to examine our journals will find that on the 25th of March of that year I reported from the committee on territories two bills, including the following measures: the admission of California, a territorial government for Utah, a territorial government for New Mexico and the adjustment of the Texas boundary. These bills proposed to leave the people of Utah and New Mexico free to decide the slavery question for themselves, in the precise language of the Nebraska bill now under discussion. A few weeks afterwards the committee of thirteen took those bills and put a wafer between them and reported them back to the Senate as one bill, with some slight amendments. One of these amendments was, that the territorial legislatures should not legislate upon the subject of African Slavery. I objected to this provision, upon the ground that it subverted the great principle of self-government, upon which the bill had been originally framed by the territorial committee. On the first trial the Senate refused to strike it out, but subsequently did so, upon full debate, in order to establish that principle as the rule of action in territorial organizations." The Union comments thus upon my speech on that occasion: " Thus it is seen that in framing the Nebraska-Kansas bill, Judge Douglas framed it in the terms and upon the model of those of Utah and New Mexico, and that in the debate he took pains expressly to revive the recollection of the voting which had taken place upon amendments affecting the powers of the territorial legislatures over the subject of slavery in the bills of 1850, in order to give the same meaning, force, and effect to the Nebraska-Kansas bill on this subject as had been given to those of Utah and New Mexico. The Union proves the following propositions: First, that I sustained Clay's compromise measures on the ground that they established the principle of self-government in the territories. Secondly, that I brought in the Kansas and Nebraska bill founded upon the same principles as Clay's compromise measures of 1850; and thirdly, that my Freeport speech is in exact accordance with those principles. And what do you think is the imputation that the Union casts upon me for all this? It says that my Freeport speech is not Democratic, and that I was not a Democrat in 1854 or in 1850! Now, is not that funny? (laughter) And please! Think that the author of the Kansas and Nebraska bill was not a Democrat when he introduced it. The Union says I was not a sound Democrat in 1850 nor in 1854, nor in 1856, nor am I in 1858 because I have always taken and now occupy the ground that the people of a territory, like those of a State, have the right to decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist in a territory. I wish to cite for the benefit of the Washington Union and the followers of that sheet,

one authority on that point, and I hope the outhonty will be deemed satisfactory to that class of politicians. I will read from Mr. Buchanan's letter accepting the nomina- tion of the Democratic Convention for the Presi- dency. You know that Mr. Buchanan, after he was nominated, declared to the Keystone Club, in a public speech, that he was no longer James Bu- chanan, but the embodiment of the Democratic platlorm. In his letter'to the committee which in- formed him of hi,- nomination, accepting it he de- fined the meaning of the Kansas and Nebraska bill and the Cincinnati platform in these words: "The recent legislation of Oongrtss respecting domestic slavery, derived as it has been from the original and pure fountain ol 1*. gaimate political power, the will of the majori- ty, prom ses ere long to allay ihe dangerous excitement. Tnis leglsladon is fouodecl upon prlnt-iiiles as ancient as f ee governiieDt Itself, and in accordance with them has sim-ly declared that the people of a terrlriy like thoseot a State shall decide fbr themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist witliia iheii lim ts " . hiis you see that .James Buchanan accepted the noniiuation -at Cincinnati, on the condition that the people of a territory, like those of a State, should be left to decide for themselves whether slavery should, or should not exist within their limits. I fhf^*^w/ " Buchanan for the Presidency on noljiS 1"? ^,?d(Jpted at Cincinnati, and^ex Pht .f ^r"" """"^f- ^ ^""^ elected President on that platform, and now we are told by the Wash- ington Union that no man is a true Democrat who stands on the platform on which Mr. Buchanan was nominated and which he has explained and ex pounded himself. (jUaghiae.) We are told that a man is not a Demrcrat who stands by Clay Web- fc'S; "" j V,"""*,^*""* ""e Compromise measures of iSSO, and the Kansas and Nebraska bill of 1854 Whether a man be . Democrat or not on that platform' ?-i*r*B*-et-9.) I intend to cling firmly to that great principle which declares thS right of each State and each territory to settle the question of slavery and every other domestic questioi; for themselves. I hold that if they want a slave .State they have a right under the Constitution of the Oni ted states to make it so, and if they want a free State, It IS their right to have it. But the Unio-n, in advocating the claims of Lincoln over me to the benate, lays down two unpardonable heresies which It says I advocate. The first, is the right of the peo- ple of a territory, the same as a State, to decide for themselves the question whether slavery shall exist within their limits, in the language of Mr ! K^h t"""" V*"" ^""^ 'A<""""J "" . 'hat a constitution shall be submitted to the people ot a territory (or Its adoption or reiection before their admission as a State under it. It so happens that Mr. Buchanan is ^K ?"! ' ? "" ,"" *ese heresies, for supporting which the Washington Unim. has read me out of the Democratic church. In his imnual message he said that he trusted that the example ofthe Minne- sota case would be followed in all future cases re- quiring a submission of the constitution : and in his letter of acceptance, he said that the people ol a territory, the same as a State, had the ril;ht to decide for ihemselfes whether slavery should exist withm their limits. Thus you find that this little corrupt gang who control the Union, and wish to elect Lincoln m preference to me-because, as they : say, of these two heresies which I support-de r ?t f""j^' ""^="^""^ ""en they denounce me, If he stands now by the principles upon which notTjif "!!?-i, !^"" "-^^^ P'-^'^d that he does eW? Ti. n ^u^*!" Pr^^P'^s ""^ "-h'Ch he was tT^!t\, u" *y .J.old "" he has abandoned

the Wsn^tIH "" ""i- '^^ ""<"nnati platorm, and dZZ^ tbi 'k?^-*!/? bis nomination, all of which declare the right of the people o! a territory the same as a State, to deciSe tL slavery quSn tor ortoelr ^ r!'" "" ^1, """"^ ""^ ^ '^^^ betrayed or intends to betray the plat.orm which elected him (jtaaA).. but If he does, I will not follow him t, W*ft-ain.) I iviil stand by that great prmci- Ev'itT.rTv, "" "" "" ""> ""^ '^^"- I "tend to's and tif V .i^" P'^-'pose of preserving peace between the North and tiie South, the free and the alv^ States. ^fc*,fc,fe^i,l.") If eacI SkaTe will only agree to mind itroSTbusiness andle' US neighbors alone, there will be peace forever be rZv T^ f ^ in Illinois tried slavery when a te": XoHshed it WT ^""uf ins*-- ^^i hence we aooiisned It. We then adopted a free ,State onnisti havrdedaTe^t'h't""*"" *' "" ""^tarwe ('llu-^"f.jii ?!, ""*"" "" "" ""he a citizen uorblTslav'e w" ^7 '*'* declared that he shall cy Miionri ^ had'. right to adopt that poli- ty adoprthe"o7her""olic;""<sL^fT ^ ""^ morals of thfn^T' '.S.^*"- ^ 'A "" discuss the Ho .t . . people ol Missouri, bat let them set P^of"h""slavVh"iH""^""^""^"- lholdthath?peo- pie Of the slaveholding States are civilized men n we Ts' we"Tnd?h\"^".I' "" "" '>""> cons'-enTes S m m 4' li&iu^'

:^S^ I I \. t :M'-

^ 1 I .^=- # qiuestion. If we will stand by that principle, then Mr. Lincoln will find that this republic can exist torever oivided into free and slave State.-, as our fathers made it and the people of each State have decided. Stand by that great principle and we can go on as we have done, increasing in wealth, in pop- ulation, in power, and in all the elements of great- ness, umil we shall be the admiraion and terror of the world. We can go on and enlarge as our pop- ulation increases, and we require more room, until we make this continent one ocean-bound rcDublic. Under that principle tb United States can perform tnat great mission, that destiny which Providence has marked out for ub. Under that principle we can receive with entire saiety that stream ol intel- '5^*""=e which is constantly flowing from-the Old World to the New, filling up onr prairies, clearing cur wildernesses and building cities, towns, tm\ roads and other internal improvements, and' thus ""^u ""1?,*'= asylum of the oppressed of the whole earth. We have this gieat mission to perform, and it Can only be performed bv adhering faith- tully to that principle ot sell-government on which our institutions were all estab- lished. I repeat that the principle is the right of each State, each territory, to decide this slavery question for itself, to have slaverv or not, as it chooses, and it does not become Mr. Lincoln, or anybody else, to tell the people of Kentuck<y that they have no consciences, that they are living in a state of iniquity, and that they are cherishing an institution to their bosoms in violation of the law of God. Better for him to adopt the doctrine of "judge notlestye bejudged." CMiimil)im4- ajgjffi | aiP) Let him perform his own duty at home, and he will have a better fate in the future. I think there are objects of charity enough in the free States to ex cite the sympathies and open the pockets of all the benevolence we have amongst us, without going aoroad in search of negroes, of whos<! condition we know nothing We have enough objects of charity at home, and it is our

duty to take care of our own poor, and our own suffering, before we go abroad to intermeddle with other people's business. ' My friends, I am told that my time is within two minutes of expiring. I have omitted many topics that I would like to have discussed before you at length. There were many points touched by Mr. Lincoln that I have not been able to take up for the want of time. I have hurried over each subject that I have discussed as rapidly as possible so as to omit but few, but one hour and a half is not time sufficient for a man to discuss at length one half of the great questions which are now dividing the public mind. In conclusion, I desire to return to you my grateful acknowledgements for the kindness and the courtesy with which you have listened to me. It is something remarkable that in an audience as vast as this, composed of men of opposite politics and views, with their passions highly excited, there should be so much courtesy, kindness and respect exhibited not only towards one another, but towards the speakers, and I feel that it is due to you that I should thus express my gratitude for the kindness with which you have treated me. (NVM ehiaat&jyM'lifcere'gweir'fafpPpugtan.) Mr. Lincoln's Rejoinder. ,0a taking the stand, Jtr. Lmgo^r^wasreeeised mtia-4remendous cheer. He said : My Friends : Since Judge Douglas has said to you in his conclusion that he had not time in an hour and a half to answer all I had said in an hour, it follows of course that I will not be able to answer in half an hour all that he said in an hour and a half. fttuwwamiiAidatiyhtM-. I wish to return* Judge BHHf^ Douglas my profound thanks for his public announcement hereto-day, to be put on record, that his system of policy in regard to the institution of slavery contemplates that it, shall last forever. I*)iat--*6fj-i-BBd.oiaes_ol-iijliWin-- agiai"j We are getting a little nearer the true issue of this controversy, and I am profoundly grateful for this one sentence. Judge Douglas asks you "why cannot the institution of slavery, or rather, why cannot the nation, part slave and " part free, continue as our fathers made it for- "ever?" In the first place, I insist that our fathers did not make this nation half slave and half free, or part slave and part free. ^-npliii-fiifv, aad^si-SCHayASo." I insist that that they found the institution of slavery existing here. They did not make it so, but they left it so because they knew of no way to get rid of it at that time. ^i'aBod;^*u^fd{M""TII"*WHraK" When Judge Douglas undertakes to say that as a matter of choice the fathers of the government made this nation part slave and part free, he assumes that is historically a falsehood. P^aB#MeiMin#a4wbMi^e^Morc than that; when the fathers of the government cut off the source of slavery by the abolition of the slave trade, and adopted a system of restricting it from the new territories where it had not existed, I maintain that they placed it where they understood, and all sensible men understood, it was in the course of ultimate extinction. -ttny'Mi ioW and when Judge Douglas asks why* cannot continue: as our fathers made it, I ask, him why he and his friends could not let it remain as our fathers made it? awaaeadoMfe "-U?s'^eoiely all I ask of him in relation to the institution of slavery, that it shall be placed, upon the basis that our fathers placed it upon. Mr. Brooks, of South Carolina, once said, and truly said, that when this government was established, no one expected the institution of slavery to last until this day; and that the men who formed this government were wiser and better

men than the men of these days; but the men of these days had experience, which the others had not, and that experience had taught them the invention of the cotton gin, and this had made the perpetuation of the institution of slavery a necessity in this country. Judge Douglas could not let it stand upon the basis upon which our fathers placed it, but removed it and put it upon the cotton gin basis. It is a question, therefore, for him and his friends to answer why they could not let it remain where the fathers of the Government originally placed it. I hope nobody has understood me as trying; to sustain the doctrine that we have a right to quarrel with Kentucky, or Virginia, or any of the slave States, about the institution of slavery thus giving the Judge an opportunity to make himself eloquent and valiant against us in fighting for their rights. I expressly declared in my opening speech, that I had neither the inclination to exercise, nor the belief in the existence of the right to interfere with the States of Kentucky or Virginia in doing as they pleased with slavery or any other existing institution. Then what becomes of all his eloquence in behalf of the rights of States which are now living? Give it to them just all you can" and, on the other hand, I say to Carlin, and Jake Davis, and to this man Wogley up here in Hancock, "Give it to Douglas just pour it into him." Uieera and laugi4*-vQe4i8*--yi/" "Uflrrah for Luisoliaki" Now in regard to this matter of the Dred Scott decision, I wish to say a word or two. After all, the Judge will not say whether if a decision is made holding that the people of the States do not exclude slavery he will support it or not. He obstinately refuses to say what he will do in that case. The Judges of the Supreme Court as obstinately refused to say what they would do on this subject. Before this I reminded him that at Galesburg he had said the Judges had expressly declared the contrary and you remember in my opening speech I told him I had the book containing that decision here, and I would thank him to lay his finger on the place where any such thing was said. He has occupied his hour and a half, and he has not ventured to try to sustain his assertion. He is desirous of knowing how we are going to reverse the Dred Scott decision. Judge Douglas ought to know how. Did not he and his political friends find a way to reverse the decision of that same Court in favor

of the constitutionality of the National Bank? Can it be reversed? Didn't they find a way to do it so effectually that they have reversed it as completely as any decision ever was reversed so far as its practical operation, is concerned? Others, as Mr. B. says, "And let me ask you, didn't Judge Douglas find a way to reverse the decision of our Supreme Court, when it decided - that Mr. Lincoln's father old Governor Lincoln had not the constitutional power to remove a Secretary of not appeal to the 'mob' as he calls them? Did he not make speeches in the lobby to show how villainous that decision was, and how it ought to be overthrown? Did he not succeed! too in getting an act passed by the Legislature - to have it overthrown? And didn't he himself sit down on that bench as one of the five added judges, who were to overrule the four old ones getting his name not 'Judge' in that way and no other? Under the circumstances, is there a villainy, in using disrespect or making opposition to Supreme Court's decisions, I commend it to Judge Douglas' earnest consideration. Mr. Lincoln knows of no man in the State but Illinois, who ought to know so well about how much villainy it takes to oppose a decision of the Supreme Court, as our honorable friend, Stephen A. Douglas. Judge Douglas also makes the declaration that I say the Democrats are bound, by the Dred Scott decision while the Republicans are not. In the sense in which he argues, I never said it; but I will tell you what I have said and what I do not hesitate to repeat to-day. I have said that as the Democrats believe that decision to be correct and that the extension of slavery is; affirmed in the National Constitution, they are: bound to support it as such; and I will tell you here that General Jackson once said each man was bound to support the Constitution "as he understood it." Now, Judge Douglas understands the Constitution according to the Dred Scott decision, and he is bound to support it as he understands it. I understand it another way, and therefore I am bound to support it in the way in which I understand it. I believe as Judge Douglas, believes that decision to be correct, I will re-make that argument if I have time to do so. Let me talk to some gentleman among you who looks me in the face.. We will say you are a member of the Territorial Legislature, and like Judge Douglas, you believe that the right to take and hold slaves is a constitutional right. The first thing you do is to swear to support the Constitution and all rights guaranteed therein; that you will, whenever your neighbor needs your legislation to support his constitutional rights, not withhold that legislation. It is you withhold that necessary legislation for the support of the Constitution and constitutional rights do you not commit perjury? I ask every sensible man, if that is not so? Yes, it is. That is undoubtedly; I tell you what you please. Now that is precisely what Judge Douglas says. That is a constitutional right. Does the Judge mean to say that the Territorial Legislature may,

^j^fe-jf.>^i4^^

inii III ""^ by withholding necessary laws, or by "passing un-""f'la'^e that promise? *-***(*. "I
 I li-iendly laws, nullify that amstitutional right?'^'^ " f'Sbt to ask ijihy he did not keep it? Does
 he mean to say that ? Do&s he meaa to ig- woiendBnaiipptettg^ I call upon him to tell iiore the
 proposition so long koopfn and well jj,'''^'-J-day why ne did not keep that promise? established
 in the law, that what you cannot do } Siat fraud ha?, been traced np so that it lies be- directly, you
 canootdo indirectly ? Ows he mean *"8en him, "Harris and Lanphier. There is lit- tliat ? The truth
 about the matter is tbii: Judge *'e room for escape for Laupbier, f liftj^rr 1 Douglas has sung paeans
 to his " Popuiar Sove^ i^Mphier is domg the Judge good service, and reiguty" doctrine until bjs
 aupreme Court co- -Uougla-i desires his word to be taken for the operating with him has squatted
 hh Snuuttar.i * ' '''. He desires Lanohier to be taken asau- Sovereignty out. tOiu!aiMaoua-iM'8*i*w-
 <IM*i>-t ""-ity in vyhat he states in his newspaper. He mrtllili But he will keep up this species of
 hum-', <*sires Harris to be taken as a man of vast buggery about Squatter Bovereignty. He hasaU
 ^'edibility, and when this thing lies among last iiventd this sort ot do-nothing Sovereignty "them,
 they will not press it to show where the SSSKlaigBter that the people may ex- gnilt really belongs.
 Now, as he has said that elude slavery by a sort of " Sovereignty" that is he would investigate it,
 and implied that be exercised by doing nothing at all. tiailljauei} I-would tell us the result of his
 investigation I JanBtlnii Is not that rnnniug his Popular Sove. idemand of him to tell why he did not
 investi- reignty dowuawtuUy? ttSagBBK. , Has it not igateit.it he did not; and if he did, why he got
 down as thin as the homoeopathic soup tliat won^t tell the result, rttoat (Th(iiiia 1 I call was made
 by boiling the shadow or a pigeon that i upon him for that had starved to deajh ? JBaaufcJaUte*-
 *ad: This is the third time thaJ Judge Douglas has But at last, when it is brought to ther, assumed
 that he learned about these resolutions C^AftjMUC.I test of Close reasoning, there is not even t,
 at tbia decoolion of it left. It is a presumption impossi- ble in the domain of thought. It is precisely
 no other than the putting of that most unphilosopjii- cal proposition, that two bodies may occupy
 the same space at the same time. The Dred Sc tt decision covers the whole ground, and while it,
 occupies it, there is no room even for the sh.idow of a starved pigeon to occupy the same grounck
 *i.VoioE, on-the p'laifOTin "Yotff tiire' fe*I- most out." LRtttd cries df""Go onr g9 an-" i-We'll listen
 Uday;'^ ' W%43Mi**!*n*Kw***tosj^^ Judge' to Douglas, in reply to what I have said about hav-
 ing upon a previous occasion made the spedch at Ottawa as the one he took an extract from,: at
 Charleston, says it only shows that 1 pract:qed the deception twice. Now, my friends, are ahy of you
 obtuse enough to swallow that ? f *4fe^8^ efti're,;aBeti.eh'4oeliis" Judge Douglas had said I had
 made a speech at Cl^arleston that I would not make up north, and t turned arbund and answered
 him by showing I had made that same speech up north -had made it at Ottawa made it in his
 hearing made i,t in the Abolition District in Lovejoy's District in the personal presence of Lovejoy
 himself in the same at- mosphere exactly in which I had made my Chi- cago speech of which he
 complains so much. ' Now, in relation to my not having said any- thing about the quotation from

the Chicago Spect: He thinks that is a terrible subject for the tonandle. Why, gentlemen, I can show you by Harris' attempting to use them against Nor ton on the floor of Congress. I tell Judge Douglas the public records of the country show that he himself atte/mpiied it upon TrumbuU a month before Harris tried them on Norton LgfMt HjiiplaiiMmj-that Harris had the oppor- tunity of lea.niing it from him, rather than he from Harris. I now'isk his attention to that part of Vne record oUithe case. My friends, I am no*; disposed to detain you longer in regard to th-ut matter. J am told that I still have five minutes left. I here is another matter I wish to call attention He says, when he discovered there was u mistake in that ease, he came forward magnani- mously, without my calliog his attention to it, and explained it. I will tell you how he be- came so magnaaimous. When the newspapers of our side had discovered and published it, and put it beyond his power to deny it, then he came forward and madea viatue of necessity by acknowledging it. IUeA...,ppis* Now he argues that all the point there was in those resolutions, although never passed at Spring- fii'< is retained by .their being passed at other field. that the substance-fOt the Chicago speech I d Uvered two years ago in " Egypt," as he calls 'it. It was down at Springfield. That speech is here in this-book, and I could turn to it and read it to you but for the lack of time. 1 have no^ now the time to read it. IE'Bead it, read No, gentlemen, r*am obliged: to localities. Is that true S He said I had a hand in passing them, in his opening speech that I; was in the Convention and helped to pass them. . Do the resolutions touch me at all ? It strikes me there is some difference between holding a man responsible tor an act which he lias not done, and holding hith.responsible for an act that he lias, done. You will .judge whether there is any difference, ia the "sppts." |;lia(ifii4*iaab#s. And he has taken^J-edit lor great magnanimity in coming forward and acknowledging what is proved on him beyond even the capacity of Judge Douglas to deny, and he bar, more capacity in that way than any llcrStiSn in diiposing mbst advantageously I thl'^ZtTTiVr^T "^^ ^ "^^"^^ withdraw y brief time. I'he Judge has taken great s!a vtrv nlt^-- ?^, - -" "J^,^l^l^" ^ *". 'P^^" ot my exception to my adoptin great ,i ;the heretical statement i sia.very national, as he has withdrawn the one in the Declaration of Independence, that "all itithT^^' ir^Li^^T"- " * ""fhip, I will men are created equal," and he has a great deal' i7? ,Z : I w' .\ 't hirV t^ T Z to say about negro equality. I want t^o sav that ii applause aS ' ifu^fcl T IT^"^^** m sometimes alludia,, to the Declaration if In- ! H?tf ,mr,,o n ,>, tl^f ^ T i, -ti i """/^J ^ . dependence, I have culy uttered the sentim.ntsij eve aTfsr mNo m.n JiTi k T, "^^f^V", "J^" A.J was .tone timecalled upon in Indiana, \^S::;i^^tSi^%^^:T\^l^t^ and in a way that I suppose was very insnlwgt,. conspiracy to natioTiahze slavery, aild he sajs he to liberate his slaves, and he made a written re- convices me that this is all untrue because Bu- ply to that application, and one portion ot.^t is | clianan was not in the coimtry at that time "" wlll, i:'the/*c? of this aoepaf to meln mafi tte^ ""To? *ino""lhf'snPrf.e ""p 7* ana, to liberate the slaves under my care in Kertucky' ^ , sOt imo 1he bupreme Court; "Itls aseneraldeclaratioaintheactannouncing to the^"^^^ be sa.ys that I say the Democratic "w< rill tUs independence ot the thirteen American ojilo-;i owners^ of DredHcott got un the case I never "ncWhaXraen are'cireatea equal: Now. as an ab-;| aid aair *,,>* ta, ..!/? i t

j t j ' ^ ' ' ' ' ' Btra/-t irir cipal, ih^e it>nodouW of the tr^uthof that'i s^ ^j 'nat. AjaUaut'O J l defy Judge
 Doug- " d.'eluraion. and it is desirable in tlie of^ ^mal coft-% ^^^ to snow thai I ever said so/br I
 never utter- rfi- ui; feofsodetK. aniiin. rgap)7, e; dsoci. ^^^^^ One of Mr. Douglas' reporters gesticu-
 lated athrmatively at Mr. Lincoln. I don't cave if your hireling does say I did, I tell it in view as a
 grealt fundameatalpnnciple." r pometiraeH, iureiStion to the orga, niition of iif w ' BOOieties in nevy
 countries, where the soil is cleaa : and clear> iisisted that we shovM keep that prin- ciple ill view,
 Juugo Douglas will have it that I want a negro w^e, ^romffewtghtw. He never brovsht to understand
 that there is any 1 .middle, ground on this subject. I have lived until y fiftieth year, and have never
 had a negro Woman either for a slave or a wife, idwr^and lIhiBk I can live fifty centuries, for that
 mutter, . without having had one for either. eijlsaBi8 taeSUMk I maitnain that you may take Judge
 Douglas' quotaKons frofo my Chicago speech, you own- myself that I never said the "' Demooratio'
 J ers of Dred Scott got tip the ease. ... uatiiiiimimm I have never pretended to know whether Dred
 Scott's owners were Democrats or AhoUtionists, or Free Sellers or Border Ruf- Uaus. I have said that
 there is evidence about the case tending to show that it was a made up case, for the purpose of
 getting that decision. I have said that that evidence was very strong in m the fact that when Dred
 Scott was declared to be a slave, the owner of him made him free showing that he had had the
 case tried and the (juestipu settled for an iHMnh use as could be and. from my Ohailestou, speech,
 and the Gales-}; inade of that decision; he cared nothine about burg spesch,-in his sjreech of Jp-
 day, and com- 1 the property thus declared to be his by that de- pare them over, and I am wiiliig
 to trust them with you ujion his proposition that they show j rascality to double dealing. I deny
 that thiiy do. : The .ludge does not seem at all disposed to have peace, but I find he is disposed to
 have a . persona,! warfare with me. He says that my -i oath would not be taken against the bare
 word ;;. of Charles H.. Lanphier or Thomas L. Harris. ! Well, that is altogether a matter of opinion, j
 I lin |ji; iMpiii{ It is certainly not for me to vaunt | pision. t is out and I can say no ibore. But my time
 rioy word against oftths of these gentlemen, but f. I will tell Judge Douglas- again the facts upon
 which I *' dared^^ tn say they proved a forgery. I pointed out at Galesburgthat the publication of
 these resolutions in the Illinois State liegis- ': ter could not have been the result of accident, as the
 jfroceedinkS of that meeting bore unmis- ' takSible evidence of being done by a man who knew it
 was a forgery ; that it was a publication partly takeu from the real proceedings ol the couventidn,
 and partly from the proceedings of a convention at anolher place ; which showed that he bad the
 real proceedings before him, and taking one part of tl^e resolutions, he threw out another part and
 substituted false and fraud- ulent ones in their stead. I pointed that out to him, and also that his
 friend i-anphier, who 'vas editor ot the liegisier at that time and now is, must have known how it was
 done. Now whether lie did it or got some friend to do it for ; him, I could not tell, but he certainly
 knew all about it. I pointed outjto Judge Douglas that in his Freeport speech he had promised Ho in-
 vestigate that matter. Dees he now say he did m n\ . t.,>,-C.- ^'" %ii> ^-

I'

':,*_

i*H'>'*>y The Last Joint Debate^ |^-^u^-t''-' -D^O^^CHs^,, A>H> (^ L T O IJ ^^^? SEMATOa DOUQLAS' SPEECH. 16" ^' .auOgJjid loud-buTsts of applause greeted Sena- Douglas when he appeard on the stand. As n wai,ftbOutJ;o coi^^nca speakmg, he waji-mter- rupt^by Dr. Hope, one of the Danite faction. Di HoP3.-53udEe, before you cominenoe speak- '-ig.fallow mffto ask you a question. StNAToa i)oDQLAB. If you will not piboupy too mnAi of u;^ time. / Dp. UopE^ Only an instant, / ^NATOB Dei'GLAS. What is yotir auestion? Da. EOpb. Do you ^lieve that ^e Teip-itorial i(?aaiaHres ought to pass laws tft^roteot slavery inlhaflerritories? Smator DooatAS. You will vet an answer in IMcou'rse of my remarks. ^Appfanse.) Ladiks and Gentlemen ; It is now nearly tour months since the canvass between Mr. Lincoln and myself commenced. On the 16th of June the Re- publican Convention assembled at Springfield and nominated Mr. Lincoln as their candidate for the U. S. Senate, and he, on that occasion, delivered a speech in which he laid down what he understood to be the Republican creed and the platform on which he proposed to stand during the contest. The principal points in that speech of Mr. Lincoln's were; First, that this government could not endure permanently divided into free and slave States, as our fathers made it; that they must all become free or all become slave; all became one thing or all become the other, otherwise this Onion could not ooutinue to exist. I give you his opinions almost in the identical language he used. His second prop- osition was a crusade against the Supreme Court of the United States because of the Dred Scott deci- sion ; urging as an especial reason for his opposi- tion to that decision that it deprived the negroes of the rij^bts and benefits of that clause in the Con- stitution of the United States which guarantees to | the citizens of each State, all the rights, privileges,,' and immunities of the citizens ot the several States, i On the loth of July I returned home, and delivered i a speech to the people of Chicago, in which I an- nounced it to be my purpose to appeal to the peo- , pld of Illinois to sustain the course I had pursued in Congress. In that speech I joined issue with Mr. j Lincoln on the points which he had preseoted. Thus there was an issue clear and distinct made up l^etween us on these two propositions laid down in the speech of Mr. Lincoln at Springfield, and controverted by me in my reply to him at Chicago. On the next day, the 11th of July, Mr, Lincoln replied to me at Chicago, explaining at some length, and re-afiirming the posi- tjops which he had taken in his Springfield speech. In that Chicago speech he even went further than he bad before, and uttered sentiments in regard to tae negro being on an equality with the white man. f5hill) He adopted in support of this position MB argument which Lovejpy and Codding, and other Abolition lecturers had made familiar in the > orthern and oentral portions of the State, to wit: *iat the Declaration of Independence having de I ared all men free and equal,by Divine law,also that i!.egro equality was an inalienable right, of which they could not he deprived. He insisted, in that speech, that the Declaration of

Independence included the negro in the clause asserting that all men were created equal, and went so far as to say that no man was allowed to take the position, that it did not include the negro, others might take the position that it did not include other men. He said that all these distinctions between this man and that man, this race and the other race, must be discarded, and we must all stand by the Declaration of Independence, declaring that all men were created equal. The issue thus being made up between Mr. Lincoln and myself on three points, we went before the people of the State. During the following seven weeks, between the Chicago speeches and our first meeting at Ottawa, he and I addressed large assemblies of the people in many of the central counties. In my speeches I confined myself closely to those three positions which he had taken controverting his proposition that this Union could not exist as our fathers made it, divided into free and slave States, controverting his proposition of a crusade against the Supreme Court because of the Dred Scott decision, and controverting his proposition that the Declaration of Independence included and meant the negroes as well as the white men, when it declared all men to be created equal. (Oben^{4a}UIC[^]) I supposed at that time that these propositions constituted a distinct issue between us, and that the opposite positions we had taken upon them we would be willing to be held to in every part of the State. I never intended to waver one hair's breadth from that issue either in the north or the south, or wherever I should address the people of Illinois. I hold that when the time arrives that I cannot proclaim my political creed in the same arms not only in the northern but the southern part of Illinois, not only in the north but the southern States, and wherever the American flag waves over American soil, that then there must be something wrong in that creed. ("Good^{ti}SCKBii" tMX-akeere.) So long as we live under a common institution, so long as we live in a confederacy of sovereign and equal States, joined together as one for certain purposes, that any political creed is radically wrong which cannot be proclaimed in every State, and every section of that Union alike. I took up Mr. Lincoln's three propositions in my several speeches, analyzed them, and pointed out what I believed to be the radical errors contained in them. First, in regard to his doctrine that this government was in violation of the law of God which says, yiftt a house divided against itself cannot stand, I radiated it as a slander upon the immortal "right," and cheers.) This government was made upon the great basis of the sovereignty of the States, the right of each State to regulate its own domestic institutions to suit itself, and that right was conferred with understanding and expectation. I do not think that inasmuch as each locality had separate interests, every locality must have different and distinct local and domestic institutions, corresponding to its wants and interests. Our fathers knew when they made the government, that the laws and institutions which were well adapted to the green mountains of Vermont, were unsuited to the rice plantations of South Carolina. They knew then, as well as we know now, that the laws and institutions which would be well adapted to the beautiful prairies of Illinois would not be suited to the mining regions of California. They knew that in a Republic as broad as this, having such a variety of soil, climate and interest, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of local laws, the policy and institutions

of each State adapted to its condition and wants. For this reason this Union was established | on the right of each State to do as it pleased on ' the question of slavery, and every other question; j and the various States were not allowed to com- plain of, much less interfere, with .the policy of their neighbors, ("j;hai'-go<>d.AtnB^iitbiit-'8"the. doctrine,"^nd cheers.) Su >pose the doctrine advocated by Mr. Lincoln and the abolitionists of this day had prevailed when the Constitution was made, what would have been the result? Imagine for a moment that Mr. Lincoln had been a member of the convention that framed the Constitution of the United States, and that when its members were about to sign that wonderful document, he had arisen in that conven- tion as he did at Springfield this summer, and ad- dressing himself to the President, had said "a 1 house divided against itself cannot stand; (Imgji ; ^K^his government divided into free and slave States cannot endure, they must all be free or all be slave, they must all be one thing or all be the other, otherwise, it is a violation of the law of God, and cannot continue to exist;" suppose Mr. Lincoln had convinced that body of sages, that that doctrine was sound, wh^ would have been the result? Re- member that the Union was then composed of thir- teen States, twelve of which were slaveholding and one free. Do you think that the one free State would have outvoted the twelve slaveholding States, and thus have secured the abolition of slavery? (Jll, aa.) On the other hand, would not the twelve slaveholding States have outvoted the one free State, and thus have fastened, slavery, by a Consti- tutional provision, on every foot of the American Republic forever? You see that if this abolition doctrine of Mr. Lincoln had prevailed when the government was made, it would have established slavery as a permanent institution, in all the States whether they wanted it or not, and the question for as to aetermine in Illinois now as one of the free States is, whether or not we are willing, having be come the majority section, to. enforce a doctrine on the minority, which we would have resisted with our heart's blood had it been attempted oa us when ., we were in a minority. ('i.Wft sever, .will,,!.; good, good, and, oheeia.) ilow has ihe South lost her power as the majority section in this Union, and now have the free States gained it, except under the operation of that principle which declares tbe right !! of the people of each State and, each territory to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. It was under that principle that ! slavery was abolished in New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jereev,' and ; Pennsylvania; it was under that principle that oue ' half of the slaveholding States became free ; it was under that principle that the number of free States increased until from being one^outot twelve States, we have grown to be the majority of States of the whole Union, with the power to control the House of Representatives and Senate, and the power, con- sequently, to elect a President by Northern votes without the aid of a Southern State, Having ob- tained this power under the operation of that great principle, are you now prepared to abandon the principle and declare that merely because we have the power you will wage a war asiainst the South ern States and their institutions until you force them to abolish slavery everywhere. (NC)Si.o)>Miii, and groat oppfmwe.) After having pressed these arguments home on Mr. Lincoln for seven w^feks, publishing a number of my speeches, we met at Ottawa in joint

discussion, and he then began to crawl a little, and let himself down. (timnoBBeiniayptaBae.) 1 here pro- pounded certain questions to him. Amongst others, I asked him whether he would vote for the admission of any more slave States in the event the people wanted them. He would not answer, Ubp pl-adaaslrtrt) 1 then told him that if he did not answer the question there I would renew it at Freeport, and would then trot him down into Egypt and again put it to him. (ttimtm^ Well, at Freeport, knowing that the next joint discussion took place in Egypt, and being in dread of it, he did answer my question in regard to no more slave States in a mode which he hoped would be satisfactory to me, and accomplish the object he had in view. I will show you what his answer was. After saying that he was not pledged to the Republican doctrine of "no more slave States," he declared created, and now again assert, that in my opinion a government can endure forever, ipi |j|) <it-Ti.4. d Into free and slave States as our fathers made it, each State having the right to prohibit, abolish, or sustain slavery just as it pleases, ('iniirii^ I state to you freely, frankly, that I should be exceedingly sorry to ever be put in the position of having to pass upon that question, I should be exceedingly glad to know that there never would be another slave State admitted into this Union." Here, permit me to remark, that I do not think the people will ever force him into a position against his will. (Qit laughter n4-;fflJui.) He went on to say: "But I must add in regard to this, that if slavery shall be kept out of the territory during the territorial existence of any one given territory and then the people should, having a fair chance and clear field when they come to adopt a constitution, if they should do the extraordinary thing of adopting a slave constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but we must admit it into the Union." That answer Mr. Lincoln supposed would satisfy the old-line Whigs, composed of Kentuckians and Virginians, down in the southern part of the State. Now, what does it amount to? I desired to know jmaW3 in aO O.WV1..W. ..j^.... .., ----- . . ., , , ^- ^, ^ .. UU.WUUV liw . jl uu^l^U UU &UUVT ners of our constitution. I then said, have often whether he would vote to allow Kansas to come into the Union with slavery or not, as her people desired. He would not answer; but in a round about way said that if slavery should be kept out of a territory during the whole of its territorial existence, and then the people, when they adopted a State

^jyjgc^ f' u

A constitution, asked admission as a slave State he supposed he would have to let the State come in. The case I put to him was an entirely different one I desired to know whether he would require for a member of Congress, thus in effect declaring that if the people of Kansas would only consent to come into the Union under the Leocompton Constitution, and have a slave State when they did not want it, they should be admitted with a population of 85,000, but that if they were so obstinate as to insist upon having just such a constitution as they thought best, and to desire admission as a free State, then they should be kept out until they had 93,420 inhabitants. I then said,



Illinois political campaign of 1858. <http://www.loc.gov/resource/lprbscsm.scsm1048>

question. I have said everywhere, and now repeat ^^^f ess m all the States where elections have re- it to you, that if the people of Kansas want a slave ^f^y ^f" ^^^^> was pledged against the Enelish State they have a right, under the constitution of Sr'i "i r R,^"5^Ps one or two exceptions the United States, to form such a State, and I will t ' : ""^ ""^ done as these Anti- let them come into the Union with slavery or with- f'.^"? Pton naen who voted for the Enelish out, as they determine (" That's right," " good," "V'W ^g""8.s. pledging themselves to refule to hurrah for Douglas all the time,"-aniehwiM.) If r, r-^?"^ ^ she refused to become a slave State the people of any other territory desire slavery let , 5 ? t ^ Popnla*-ion of 93,4:20, and then re- themhaveit. If they do not want it let them pro- ""S ""^"" P""?. forfeited their pledge and' hibit It. It is their business not mine. ('iXbatJsA "*" ,? 5 "ow pledge to admit Kansas at any time she *aotfcst,&.,thai's so," hurrah, &e.) It is none of W"^"without regard to population, I would have our business in Illinois whether Kansas is a free , ^ " trouble. You saw the whole power and pa- State or a slave State. ("3Ch*4bftAita*") It ; ^' ""^""^ nS federal government wielded in In- is none of your business in Missouri whether Kan- ' : ""^""^""> ""d Pennsylvania to jre elect Anti-Le- sas shall adopt slavery or reject it. It is the busi- " oompton men to Congress who voted against Le- ness of her people and none of yours. The people 5 P"" 'ed for the Enghsh bill, and then of Kansas has as much right to decide that question I aenounced the En lish bill, aud pledged themselves for themselves as you have in Missouri to decide it i l-" P^op'e to disregard it. (GMtd.) My sin con- for yourselves, or we in Illinois to decide it for our- i f^"? "" * having eiyen a pledge, and then in not selves. ("That's what we believe," "We stand by i f,*'.^""K"tterwards forfeited it. For that reason in thHt^atid-ctoers.) ; *"> "tate, every postmaster, every route agent 'And here I may repeat what I have said in every > ^""K^ collector ot the ports, and every federal office speech I have made in Illinois, that I fought the nomer. torieits his head the moment he expresses Leoompton constitution to its death, not because of a preterenoe for the Democratic candidates against the slavery clause in it, but because it was not the ^!^^ ""r his abolition associates. (Thatls-se, act and deed of the people of Kansas. I said then ,f"idiohooro.) A Democratic Administration which in Congress,, and I say now, that if the people of we helped to bring into power, deems it cohistent Kansas want a slave State, they have a right to have W". ""s ndelity to principle and its regard to duty, it. If they wanted the Lecompton constitution, "" ^^^d its power in this State in behalf of the Re- they had a right to have it. I was opposed to that P>o"ean abolition candidates in every county and constitution because I did not believe that it was the ' ^^^^f-^ l'Ongressional districtagainst the Democratic act and deed of the people, but on the contrary, the ^ 7h -e u^ * ^*^ ' reference to the matter act of a small;.pitiful minority acting in the name "" that if that administration, have not regard of the majority. When at last it was determined T""f^^ / P""^iple, if they are not sufficiently to send that constitution back to the people, and ac. ehed to the creed ot the Demooratio party to cordingly, in August last, the question ct admission : ""^?oreyer their personal hostilities in order to under it was submitted to a popular vote, the citi- suocceeded in carrying out our glorious principles, I zens rejected it by nearly ten to one, thus showing ' ^""; .(oo<ij"*g6di-amj cheers.) I have no per- conclusively, that



I was right when I said that the Jeffersonian dimculties with Mr Buchanan or his cabinet. Lecompton constitution was not the act and deed of , " ""^""^ | certain rebawiuenaSTSnstotar- the people of Kansas, and did not embody their gress as he had a righC to do on the Lecompton will R V^ ifirj) .I question. I could not vote in favor of tliem. I had I hold that there is no power on earth, under our t as nauoh right to judge for myself how I should system of government, which has the right to force 5 j" , ^.^ ^d how he should recommend. He un- a constitution upon an unwilling people. ^ka*s dertook to say to me, if you do not vote as I tell aia^ Suppose there had been a majority of ten to i" ?,"! .1, w'{' tke off the heads of your friends, one in favor of slavery in Kansas, and suppose (. * *) I replied to him, "you did not elect there had been an abolition President, and an abo- me, i represent Illinois and I am accountable lition administration, and by some means the aboli- } tP^l'^, ^l, .^ constituency, aud to God, tiouists succeeded in forcing an abolition conatitu- but not to the I resident or to any other power on tion on those slaveholding people, would the people ^* j j ("*^--<d,raB4t*roS'!-<tppiag.) of the South have submitted to that act for one in- , ? "w this warfare is made on me because I stant. (ik>rB) Well, if you of the South would would not surrender my connections of duty, be- not have submitted to it a day, how can you, as "ause I would not abandon my constituency, and re- fair, honorable and honest men insist on putting a "t^^A orders of the executive authorities how I slave constitution on a people who desire a free ?,^"" j .' t'e Senate of the United States. State. (!*i!^K,!idheeM.) Your safety and ^^6"flf'^^ *'*">a-ie |i^^ I hold that ours depend upon both of us acting in good faith, ?, "ttempt to control the Senate on the part of the and living up to that great principle which asserts J^^omiye is subcrsive of the principles of our the right of every people to form aad regulate their , oonstitution. (.>>>yrmfc>ni. |jh.") the Executive de-domestio institutions to suit themselves, subject ,; P^rtment is independent of the Senate, and the only to the Constitution of the United States. | senate is independent of the President. In matters "" SluiA5**ijloatnae,:.' and iiwiMai8e.ppiaaB.) ! l 'eg's'ation the President has a veto on the action Most of the men who denounced my course on the i ?v a senate, and in appointments and treaties scompton question, objected to it not becamea I i * oenate has a veto on the President. He has no as not rieht. but because they thoueht it exoedi " ""r "^g.ht^^to tell me how I shall vote on his a Lecompton question, v/jv^.w.^ uv . ^.^.^ j was not right, but because they thought it expedi ent at that time, for the sake of keeping the party together, to do wrong. (<ih>g!) I never knew the Democratic party to violate any one of its princi- ples out of policy or expediency, that it did not pay the debt with sorrow. There is no safety or suo- cess for our party unless we always do right, and trust the consequences to God and the people. I chose not ftS^epart from principle for the sake of ejspediencyTn the Lecompton question, and I never intend to do it on that or any other question. But I am told that I would have been all right if I had only voted for the Eugliah bill after Lecompton was killed. (UtsgitfrmtiitjgBS^-) You know a general pardon was granted to all political offenders on the Leoompton question, provided they would only voi? for the Engli-sh bil'. I did not accept the bem iirt of that pardon, for theresson that - "-= '- ^*^ ""^ ^n. .1 oumi vuie on Ills ap- pointments

than I have to tell him whether he shall ; veto or approve a bill that the Senate has passed. Whenever you recognize the right of the Executive ; to say to a Senator, "do this, or I will take off the heads of your friends," you convert this govern- ment from a republic into a despotism. f+JGriii, *i^Bii-
lii.) Whenever you recognize the right of a President to say to a member of Con- greaa, "vote as I tell you, or I will bring a power to bear against you at home which will crush you " you destroy the independence of the representative /"A^u"";^*"" "" "" "" ""o' of Executive power' (Jjiat*.V,'jui.Afiplaw) J resisted this inva- sion of the constitutional rights of a Senator, and I intend to resist it as long as I have a voice to speak or a vote to give. Yet.Ilr. Buchanan cannot prol voke me to abandon one iota of Democratic princi- ples out of revenge or hostility to bis ...iOUi vui, uoiuuu, ii uiio I oirouu .iiiai, f,"","", "j' ->"6= "" uouuiy IO 018 COUrSe. ih'adbeenri^ht in the course I had pursued, and I,rYf""god, three obMrsAtfWu^ 1 stand hence did not require any forgiveness. Let us see "J P^tlorm ot the Democratic party, aud by its aow the result has been worked out. English ^p" ^T'T ^"PP"";* 'ts nominees. If there hrouaht in his bill referring the Lecompton Consti-i "tZ ^ * choose to bolt, the fact only shows that tution back to the peorile, with the provision that) ;y are not as good Democrats as I am. ("JUi*t' if it was rejected Kansas sho'id be kept out of tb- ' "" ^"d. ml-mUw84 n

1 1 | 4:

.>^J .r, 4

' t JJ | Wpiill!HHWM * I^H.V'^ 'B^^^^F I 1 My friends, there never was a time when it was as important for the Democratic party, for all national men, to rally and stand together as it is to-day. We find all sectional men giving up past differences and continuing the one question of slavery, and when we find sectional men thus uniting, we should unite to resist them and their treasonable designs. Such was the case in 1850. when Olay left the quiet and peace of his home, and again entered upon public life to quell agitation and restore peace to a distracted Union. Then we Democrats, with Cass at our head, welcomed Henry Clay, whom the whole nation regarded as having been preserved by God for the times. He became our leader in that great fight, and we rallied around him the same as the Whigs rallied around old Hickory in 1832, to put down nullification. (Sist^i) Thus you see that whilst Whigs and Democrats fought fearlessly in old times about banks, the tariff, distribution, the specie circular, and the sub treasury, all united as a band of brothers when the peace, harmony, or integrity of the Union was im periled. (TijStttenamH-UppWaw.) It was so in 1850, when abolitionism had even so far divided this country, North and South, as to endanger the peace of the Union ; Whigs and Democrats united in, es- tablishing the compromise measures of that year, and restoring tranquillity and good feeling. Thesj measures passed on the joint action of the two par- ties. They rested on the great principle that the people of each State and each territory should be left perfectly free to form and regulate their domes- tic insti'utions to suit themselves. You Whigs and we Democrats

justified them in that principle. In 1851, when it became necessary to organize the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, I brought forward the bill on the same principle. In the Kansas-Nebraska bill you find it declared to be the true intent and meaning of the act not to legislate slavery into any State or territory, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way. (^-WcittMifei)j(rfbaw8.) I stand on that same platform in 1858 that I did in 1850, 1854, and 1856. The Washington Union, pretending to be the organ of the Administration, in the number of the 5th of this month, devotes three columns and a half to establish these propositions: First, that Douglas, in his Freeport speech, held the same doctrine that he did in his Nebraska bill in 1854; second, that in 1854 Douglas justified the Nebraska bill upon the ground that it was based upon the same principle as Clay's compromise measures of 1850. - The Union, thus proved that Douglas was the same in 1858 that he was in 1856, 1854, and 1850, and consequently argued that he was never a Democrat. (Uww> liiugli iteK) Is it not funny that I was never a Democrat? (BBUimniimapilmr.) There is no pretence that I have changed a hair's breadth. The Union proves by my speeches that I explained the compromise measures of 1850 just as I do now, and that I explained the Kansas and Nebraska bill in 1854 just as I did in my Freeport speech, and yet says that I am not a Democrat, and cannot be trusted, because I have not changed during the whole of that time. It has occurred to me that in 1854 the author of the Kansas and Nebraska bill was considered a pretty good Democrat. (Mbaaiw.) It has occurred to me that in 1855, when I was exerting every nerve and every energy for James Buchanan, standing on the same platform then that I do now, that I was a pretty good Democrat. (Piiiiiriidiniltwtii.) They now tell me that I am not a Democrat, because I assert ' that the people of a territory, as well as those of a State, have the right to decide for themselves whether slavery can or can not exist in such territory. Let me read what James Buchanan said on that point when he accepted the Democratic nomination for the Presidency in 1856. In his letter of acceptance, he used the following language: " The recent legislation of Congress respecting domestic slavery, derived as it has been (from the original and pure fountain of legitimate political power, the will of the majority - it", promises ere long to allay the dangerous excitement. This legislation is founded upon principles as ancient as free government itself, and in accordance with them has simply declared that the people of a territory like those of a State, shall decide for themselves whether slavery shall, or SHALL NOT exist WITHIN THEIR LIMITS." Dr. Hope will there find my answer to the question he propounded to me before I commenced speaking. (VucrfeT9ni*b>wtiy*Bf~t^pinsB.) Of course no man will consider it an answer, who is outside of the Democratic organization, bolsters Democratic nominations, and indirectly aids to put abolitionists into power over Democrats. But whether Dr. Hope considers it an answer or not, every fair minded man will see that James Buchanan has answered the question, and has asserted that the people of a territory, like those of a State, shall decide for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits. I answer specifically if you want a further answer, and say that while under the decision of the Supreme Court, as recorded in the opinion of Chief Justice Taney,

slaves are j. r. - perty like all other property and can be carried into territory of the United States the same as any- other de. ^cription of property, yet when you get them there they are subject to the local law of the territory just like all other property. Ton will find in a recent speech delivered by that able and eloquent statesman, Hon. Jefferson Davis, at Ban- gor Maine, that he took the same view of this sub- ject' that I did in my Freeport speech. He there said: ' If the Inhabitants of any territory should refuse to enact such laws and police regulations as would give security to their property or to his, It would be rendered ,more or less valueless, in proportion to the difficulties o(noWing it with- out such protection. In the case of property In the labor of man. or wbat Is usually called slave property, ths hpecnrly would be so great that the owner could not ordinarily retain It Therefore, though the right would remain, the remedy being withheld, it would follow that the owner would be prao ically debarred, by the circumstances ol the case, from tailing slave property into a territory where the sense of the inhabitants was opposed to Us Introduction. So much for the oft r peated fallacy of forcing slavery upon any com- munity.' You will also find that the distinguished Speaker of the present House of Representatives, Hon. Jas. L. Orr, construed the Kansas and Nebraska bill in this same way in 1856, and also that great intel- lect of the South, Alex. H. Stephens, put the same construction upon it in Ckingress that I did in my Freeport speech. The whole South are rallying to the support of the doctrine that if the people of a Territory want slavery thoy have a, right to have it, and if they do not want it that no power on earth can force it upon them. I hold that there is no ;rinciijle on earth more sacred to all the friends of freedom than that which says that no inatitutmr., no law, no constitution, should be forced on an Uiiwiumg people contrary to their wishes; and I assert that the Kansas and Nebraska bill contains that princi- ple It is the great principle contained in that bill. It is the principle on which James Buchanan was made President. Without that principle he never would haye been mads President of the United States. I will never violate or abandon that doo- trine if I have to stand alone. (HnMah far Bmiglnn) I have resisted the blandishments a d threatu of power on the one side, and seduction on the other, and have stood immovably for that principle, figh*, ing for it when assailed by Northern mu'os, or threatened by Southern hostility. ("a!!Milr?- the taiti>a-d^hoBi-s.) I have defended it against the North and the South, and I will defend it against whoever assails it, and I will follow it wherever its logical conclusions lead me. (' So'-wiU we oH;" - ^Pufwrfaii ttouglaa.") I say to you that there is but one hope, one satety for this country, and that is to stand immovably by that principle which de- clares the right of each State and each territory to decide these questions for themselves. (SmH5?, }*Mr-:liHiO This government was founded on that principle, and must be administered in the same sense in which it was founded. But the Abolition party really think that under the Declaration of Independence the negro is equal to the white man, and that negro equality is an in- alienable right conferred by the Almighty, and hence, that all human laws in violation of it are null and void. With such men it is no use for me to argue. I hold that the signers of the Declaration of Independence had no refer- ence to negroes at all when they declared all men to be created equal. They did not mean negro, nor the savage Indians, nor the Fejee Is-

landers, nor any other barbarous race. They were speaking of white men. (< ' It'o safIMW ae,'" -iTd
cnOBi-B.) They alluded to men of European birth and European descent to white men, and to none
others, when they declared that doctrine. (i Thttl'i* Jhiiirntiti.") I hold that this government was
es- tablished on the whits basis. It was established by white men for the benefit cf white men and
their posterity forever, and should be administered by white men, and none others. But it does not
follow, by any means, that merely because the negro is not a citizen, and merely because he is not
our equal, that, therefore, he should be a slave. On the con- trary, it does follow, that we ought to
extend to the negro race, and to all other dependent races all the 1 rights, all the privileges, and ail
the immunities ' which they can exercise consistently with the safety of society. Humanity requires
that we should give them all these privileges; Christianity commands that we should extend those
privileges to them. The question then arises what are those privileges, and what is the nature and
extent of them. My answer is that that is a questioj which each State must answer for itself. We in
Illinois have decided it for our- selves. We tried slavery, kept it up for twelve years, and finding that
it was not profitable we abolished it for that reason, and became a free State. We adopted in its
stead the policy that a negro in this State shall not be a slave and shall not be a citizen. We have a
right to adopt that policy. For my part I think it is a wise and sound policy for us. You in Missouri
must judge for your- selves whether it is a wise policy for you. If you choose to follow our example,
very good; if you reject it, still well, it is your busines, not ours. So with Kentucky. Let Kentucky adopt
a policy to suit herself. If we do not like it we will keep away from it, and if she does not like ours
let her stay at home, mind he** own business and let us alone. If the people of all the States will
act on that great principle, and each State mind its own business, attend to its own affairs, take
care of its own negroes and not meddle with its neighbors, then there will be peace betweeo^he
North and the , South, the East and the West, throughout the whole ' Union. UitaMmn) Why can we
not thus have , peace? Why should we thus allow a sectional party to agitate this country, to array
the North against the South, and convert us into enemies in- stead of friend , merely that, a few
ambitious , men may ride into power on a sectional hobby ? i How long is it since these ambitious
Northern men wished for a sectional organization ? Did any one of them dream of a sectional party
as long as the North was the weaker section and the South the stronger ? Then all were opposed
to sectional parties; but the moment the North obtained the majority in, the House and Senate by
the admission of California, and could elect a President without , the aid ot Southern votes, that
moment ambitious Northern men formed a scheme to excite the -North against the South, and
make the people be govern- ed in their votes by geographical hoes, thinking that the North, being
tne stronger section, would out- vote the South, and consequently they, the leaders, would ride
in! 0 office on a sectional hobby. I am told that my hour is out. U was very short. . Mr. Unco Ill's
HePLY. ,Oa--ling, Jntr94i^4tA the ,idis;s,B,,appg;*g' ^jiggj'ing..ba'*-HW(!edM'r:XIT>colr sflft*-' Ladies and
Gentlemen : I have been some- , what, in mv own mind, complimented by a largo portion of: Jud?
e Douglas' speech I mean .that portiou which he devotes to the controversy be- tween him-elf and



the present Administration. I have met in these discussions, and he has been gradually improving in regard to his war with the Administration. At Quincy, flay before 'yesterday, he was a little more severe upon the Administration than I had heard him upon any former occasion, and I took pains to compliment him for it. I then told him to "Give it to them with all the power he has;" and as some of them were present I told them I would be very much obliged if they would give it to him about the affair. I think I have now vastly improved upon the attack he made then on the Administration. I flatter myself he has really taken my advice on this subject. All I can say now is to recommend to him and to them what I then commended to prosecute the war against one another in the most vigorous manner I say to them again " Go it, husband! Go it, bear!"

i

! ! ! !

L, .tHji'i :i *' t i'berE ia one cmer tnirg i wuj njo I leuTe this branch of the disBusstoQ-alth',._ ^ I do not consider it much of my business, any way. I refer to that; part of the Judge's re- marks where he undertakes to inTolve Mr Bu- chanan in an inconsistency. He- reads some- thing from Mr. Buchanan, from which he un- dertakes to involve him in an inconsistency; and he gets something of a cheer for having doce so. I would only rem'ind the Julge that while he is very valiantly lighting for tie Nebraska bill and the re^wal-of the iliai<*at WoiE- proBiise, it hss been but a little while' since he was the valiant advocate of the Missouri Coi^i- promiee. .(^Hisr I want to know if Bu- chanan has uoTas much right to be iBconsistent as Douglas has ? {IMd.AB{da,it!4R.ftBi>Jt^!tt,er; Douglas the exclusive right, m this country, of h&^ng on all sides of all questions ? Is nooody allowed that high privilege but himself? Is he to have an entire monopoly on that subject ? pirfiiitiJampfhtwir J So far as Judge Douglas addressed his speech to me, or so far as it was about me, it is my business to pay some attention to it. I have heard the Judge state two or three times what he has stated to day that ia a speech which I made at Springfield, Illinois, I had in a very especial- manner - complained that the Supremo Court in iheDred Scott ease had decided that a negro could never be a citizen of the United States. I have omitted by some accideiit hereto- fore to analyze this- statement, and it is required of me to notice it now. In point of fact it is un- true. I never, have complained especially oi the Dred Scott decision because it held that a negro could not be a citizen, and the Judge is always wrong when he says I ever did so compjaia of it. I have the specii here, and I will thank him or any of his friends to show where I said that a uegvo should be a citizen, and complained espe cially of the Dred Scott decision because it de- clared he could not.be one. I have done no such thing, and Judge Douglas's so persistently insisting that I have done so, has strongly im- pressed me with the

belief of a pre-determination- on his part to misrepresent me. He could not get liis foundation for insisting that I was in favo{ ol; this negro equality anywhere else as well as'he could by assuming that untrue proposition. Let me tell tuis audience what is true in i-Bga/d to that matter ^andjthe means by which tliey may correct me if I do not tell them truly 's by a recur- rence to tlie speech itself. I spoke of the Dred Scott decision in my Springfield speech, aod .1 was then endeavoring to prove that the Dred Scott decision was a portion of a system or scheme to make slavery national in this conulry. I point- ed out what things had been decided by the court. I mentioned as a fact that they had decided that a negro could not be a citizen that th y had done so, as I supposed, to deprive tlie negro, under all circumstances, of the remotest possibility of ev- er becoming a citizen and claiming the rights of a citizen of the United States unaer a-.certain .clause of the Constitu-iou. I stated that, without making any complaint of it at aTl4^;J,thea went on and stated the other points de'clde in the case, namely: that the bringing of a negro into the State of Illinois and holding him in slaveryjfor two years here was a matter in regard to which they would not decide whether it made him free or not; that they decided the further point that taking him into a United State Territory where slavery was- prohibited by act of Congress, did not make him free because that act of Congress as they held was unconstitutional. I mentioned. thesej three things as making up the points deo'dedinS that case. I mentioned them in a lump taken; in connection with the introduction of the Ne- braska bill, and the ameBdmeatof Chase, offer-' - Itmaybe.arguedthau, t, rj certain conditions;,,it muke necessities and TOjiose hem upon us. En i to ihe - extent tiat a necessity i< imposed upon a tan he musi BUbmit to It lthmkthktwasthecoatlltlon ia which we found ourselves when we pstablhcd .his government We hi slaves amoDB us, we could Boi- eet.oni Constitu- tionunless we nei-nilited thein to remain il- glwery,-we I could not jf cure the good we did s-curs If we srasueii for mere; and hivi k by necessity submitted to-tlat mact., : It does not destroy the principle that is the charter of cur Uberties. Let that ctiaarter remain as our staadard " Now I have upon all occasions declared as strongly as Judge Douglas against the dispo- sition to interfere with the existing institution of slavery. You hear me read it from the same speech from which he takes garbled extracts for the purpose of proving upon me a disposi- tion to interfere with the institution of slaverv and establish a perfect social- and Dolitical equalityjjetween negroes and white people. Allow jne while upon this subject briefly to present o#e other extract from a speech of mine more than a year ago, at Springfield, in discus- sing this very same question, soon after Judge Douglas took his ground that negroes were not included ia the Declaration of Independence- /I I think the authors of that notable instrument intended o inoluite all --en, but they did not mean to declare aU men ennAmaUresDects. They did not mean-to say all mea were eq lal in o; lor, size, iDtell'ct, moral develop- ment (ir so-!.ai capacity.. They defined with tolerable dis- tin tneis in wh t they did consider all men created eoual -eqoai in certain malie.-able rights, amonj; which ?e life, lib rty and the pursuit of happiness. This they said auii this they .eant To. y did not" mean to asseat-e obvious untruth, ttjat all were then actua ly enioiinrttat - Muality. nor yei, th.t they were ab.-iut to c- nferit immt- cha'e-y upon th m. in ta-1 they had no power to confer

suQh a boon. Tliey meant 6in,ply to detlarejthe rioM so tliat the erijrorcement of U might follow as ! as, as circum- stances Bh>,uld permit. ..They, meant to set up a standard maxim for free soci- *ty- wuich shoulu befamil arto all: oonsiautl, looked to constantly labored for, at d even though never perfectly attained. COBS antly a-prox-mated aod tbsreby eon- santiy spreading . n^ deepenini! its Influence and aug- mjintij.g toe happiness and vlue of lite to a.l p -oplj, of all colors, everywhere, a " o.." p .upic, oi There again are the sentiments I have ex- pressed in regard to the Declaration. of Inde- pendence upon a former occasion sentiments which have been put in print and read wherever anybody cared to know what so humble an in- dividual as myself chose to say in regard to it At Galesburg the other day, I said in answer to Judge Douglas, that three years ago there never had been a man, so far as I knew or be- lieved, in the whole world, who had said that the Declaration of Independence did not include negroes m the term "all men." Ire-assert it to-day. I assert that Judge Jjouglas and all his friends may search the whole records of the country, and it will be a matter of great aston- tshment to me if they shall be able to liud thut one human being three years ago had ever fet- tered the astounding sentiment that the tetm "all men" in the Declaration did not include the negro. Do not let me be misunderstood I know that more than three years ago there were men who, finding this assertion con- stantly m the way of their schemes to bring about the ascendancy and perpetuation of slavery, denied the truth of it. I know that Mr. talhoun and all the politicians of his school denied the truth of the Declaration. I know that It ran along in the mouths of some South- ern men lor a period of years, ending at last m that shameful though rather forcible declara- tion of Pettit of Indiana, upon the floor of t .e Uni;ed States Senate, that the Declaration of independence was ia that respect " a sell-evi- dent lie," rather than a self evident truth. But 1 say, with a perfect knowledge of all this hawk- lag at the Declaration without directly attack- ing It, that three years ago there never had lived a man who had ventured to assail it in the sneaking way of pretending to believe it and tbgg asserting it did not include the negro 1%S*""J. i believe the first man who ever said itwas thief Justice Taney iiT the Dred Scott case, and the next to him was our friend Ste- phen A. Douglas. L@e8ewtttd4tmMi' And >id at the time, declaratory of the right of the 1 OW it has become the catch-word of the entire people of the Territories, to exclude slawry, >vhioh was voted down by the friends of the hill. I mentioned all these things together, as evidence tending to prove a combination and conspiracy to make the institution of slavery national. In that connection and in that way I mentioned the decision on the point that a ne- gro could not be a citizen, and'Ild ho other con nection. . ' , . ' Out of this. Judge Douglas builds up his oeautiful fahrrioaion of my purpose to intro- duce a perfect, social, and political equality be- tween the white and black races. liis assertion that I made an "especial objection" (that is his exact language) to the decision on this account, is untrue in point of fact. Now while I am upon this subject, and as Henry Clav has been alluded to, I desire to place myself, in connection with Mr. Clay, as nearly right before this people as may be. i am quite aware what the Judge's object is here bv all these allusions. He knows that we are be tore an audience, having strong sympathies southward by relationship, place of birth, and so on He desires

to place me in an extremely He read upon a former oc- Abolition attitude. . . casion, and alludes without reading to-day, to a i portion of a speech which I delivered m Chica- S go. In his quottaions from that speech aa he has _ , . b _----- , * i ,i.,rf rf ade them upon former occaftons, tne extracts ! y^ajg ago had said negroes were not inciuaea ere taken in such away, as I^uppose, brings jq the. Declaration.- He brings forward partot party. I would like to call upon his friends, everywhere to consider how they have come in so sliort a tim.e to view this matter in a way so entirely different from their former belief? to afk whether they aro not being borne along by an irresistible current- whither, they know not? In answer to my proposition at Ualesburg last week, I see that some man in Chicsgo has got up a letter addressed to the Chicago i%mts to show as he professes that somebody hadsm d so before ; and he signs himself " -A-n Old Lice Whig," if I remember correctly. In the hrat nlace I would say he imsnott an Old Une Wnig. I am somewhat acquainted with Old Line W higs. I was with the Old Line Whigs from the origin to the end of that party ; I became pretty well acquainted with thero, and I know they always had some sense, whatever else you could as- cribe to them. l;aiTmim<il.l.i.r. I know there never was one who had not more sense than to try to shovtoat some man had, prior to the time I named, lia that negroes were not included m all men" in the Declaration What is the evidence I will bring forward the term of Independence. be produces? - - . , his evidence and let you see what he ofifers by way of showing that somebody more than tnree them within the definition of what is called ffar*?4n(7 taking portions of a speech which, when taken by themselves, do not present the entire sense of the speaker as expressed at the time. I propose, therefore, out of that sr- the speech, to show how one portion of it which he skipped over (taking an extract before and an extract after) will give a different idea and the true idea 1 intended to convey. It will take me some little time to read it, but I believe 1 a speech from Henry Clay-<Ae part of speech of Henry Clay which I used tobtujgfor- ward to prove precisely the contrary, fiougn- *wil I guess we are surrounded to some extent to-day by the old friends of Mr. Clay, and they will bo glad to hear anything from that authori- ty While he was in Indiana a man presented him a petition to liberate his negroes, and he (Mr Clay) made a speech in answer to it, which 1 suppose he carefully wrote out himself and wiluccupy the time in that way. caused to be published I have before me an You have heard him frequently allude to my extract from that speech which constitutes _the -Dntroversy with him in regard to the Declara- evidence this pretended " Old Live Whig at of Independence. I confess that i have Chicago brought forward to show that Mr. Clay had a struggle with Ju,dg9 Douglas on that mat- a,d- t suppose the negro was included in the matter aud 1 will try brieily to place myself declaration of Independence. Hear what Mr. right in regard to it on this occasion. 1 said ^lav a,iid : , audit is between the extracts Judge Douglas, has taken from this speech, and put in his pub- lished speeches : tion Jr^/e^^ tV^^"-^^ I

.;>-

. 'Artir' - " - .. -And what is the condition of this appeal to me? In Indiana, to liberate the slaves under my care in Kentucky? It is a general declaration, in fact, to the world of the independence of the thirteen American colonies, that all men are created equal and new as a principle, there is no doubt of the truth of "that declaration: and it, is desirable in the original constitution of society, and in organized societies to keep it in view as a great fundamental principle. But, then, I apprehend that no society that ever could exist or ever shall be formed, whether or can the equality as extended among the members of the human race. It is enforced and carried out to the extreme, as the slaveholder, the woman, the minor, the insane, the idiot, the foreigner, that will always probably remain subject to the government or another portion of the community. That declaration whatever may be the extent "fits in, was made by the delegates of the thirteen states. In the case of the slave trade, and had long existed, and was established by law. It was introduced and forced upon the colonies by the paramount law of England. Do you believe, that the declaration of the States that concurred in it intended that it should be interpreted to a virtual emancipation of all the slaves within their respective limits? Would it. Virginia and the other Southern States have ever united in a declaration, which was to be interpreted into a prohibition of slavery among them? Did any one of the thirteen colonies entertain such a design or expectation? To impose such a secret and uncavowed purpose would be to charge a political fraud upon the noblest band of patriots that ever assembled in council; a fraud upon the confederacy of the Revolution: a fraud upon the union of those States who, since constitution not only recognized the lawfulness of slavery, but permitted the importation of slaves from Africa until the year 1818." This is the entire quotation brought forward to prove that somebody previous to three years ago had said the negro was not included in the term "all men" in the Declaration. How does it do so? In what way has it a tendency to prove that? Mr. Clay says it is true as an abstract principle that all men are created equal, but that we cannot practically apply it in all cases. He illustrates this by bringing forward the cases of females, minors and insane persons with whom it cannot be enforced; but he says it is true as an abstract principle in the organization of society as well as in organized society, and it should be kept in view as a fundamental principle. Let me read a few words more. I will add some comments of my own. Mr. Clay says a little further on: "I desire no concealment of my opinions in regard to the institution of slavery. I look upon it, however, as a great evil and deeply lament that we have inherited it from the parent government; and therefore our ancestors. But here they are and the question is, how can they be best dealt with? If as a matter of nature. Existence. And we, we are bound to say the foundations of, or, of, of man would be more harmonious. Sed than I should he, to inordinate the rights of the majority among the elements. If now here in this same book in this same speech in this same extract brought forward to prove that Mr. Clay held that the negro was not included in the Declaration of Independence no such statement on his part, but the declaration that it is a great fundamental truth, which should be constantly kept in view in the organization of society and in societies already organized. But if I say a word about it - if I attempt,

as Mr. Clay said all good men ought to do, to lieop it in view it, in this "organized society," I ask to have the public eye turned upon it if I ask, in relation to the organization of new Territories that the public eye should be turned upon it forthwith I am villitied as you hear me to-day. What have I done, that I have not the license of Henry Clay's illustrious example here in doing? Have I done ought that I have not his authority for, while maintaining that in organizing new Territories and societies this fundamental principle should be regarded, and in organized society holding it up to the public view and recognizing what he recognized as, ^JXSS*Pi^H5,"PI2l. ernment? Uijjiilkiiliilil MiTW7rril' iii \^*i And when this new principle this new proposition that no human being ever thought of three years ago, is brought forward, / combat if.a^J3aving.a,u.e,vitter.dGncj, if no-i; au evil design; I combat it as having a tendency to de-humanize the negro to talie away from him the right of ever stri/ing to be a man. I combat it as being one of the thousand things constantly done m these days to prepare the public mind to make property, and nothing but property of the negro in all the States of this Union. 4iit- ^eiOdKMMi"nuT>(ii"aw ""tt'iiiiifthiMiiliM*.....*iilinli>i^-" But there is a point that I wish before leaving this part of the discussion to ask attention to. I have read, and I repeat the words of Henry Clay: I -^eslre no concealrpent of mv opinions in regard to the Institution of slavery. Ilookuponit asagre ,t evil and deep V iKment that we have dei ived it irom the parental goverrn-ment. and from our ancestors. I wish eve y slav-i in the U ited .-states was inti e country of his ancestors. But here they are; the question is how they can best be dea t with? If a state of nature existed . nd we were about to lay the foundation of s'Ciety, no man would be more strongly opposed than j should be to incorpo-ate the institution of slavery among its elements." The principle upon which I have insisted in this canvass, is in relation to laying the foundations of new societies. I have never sought to apply these principles to tlie old States lor the purpose of abolishing slavery in those States. It is no- thing but a miserable perversion of what I have sa d,"to assume that I have declared Missouri, or any other slave State shall emancipate her slaves. I have proposed no such thing. But when Mr. Clay says that inlajng the foundations of societies in our Territories where it does not exist he would be oppo-ed to the introduction of slavery as an element, I insist that we have his warrant t\s license for insisting upon the exclu- sion of that element, which he declared in such strong and emphatic language was most hateful to him. QLyJitj iinil..... Judge Douglas has again referred to a Springfield speed in whicli I said "a house divided against itself cannot stand" The Judg,* has so often made the entire quotation from that speech that I can make it from memory. I used this- language: "We arenowfarInto the fifth year since a policy was initiated witli the avowed obj ct ana confident promise of iulting Hn end to the slavery agitation. Under th^ ope- raiioD ot thispolioy, that agtttio.. has not only ; ot ceas- ed but ha' constantly auginented. In my opinion it wul > not cease until a crisis shall have been re. ched and pass- ed "A hi use civlded against its,-l(cannot stnd I believe this goven ment cannot endure permanently halt Slave and halt Fre . I do n.,t expeot the hi use to fa.l- bMtldoexnactitwillcea'etobe-ivi ed. It wdl become all one thii g, or all the otl:er. Eli her the opponents of Sluery will arrest ttie further spread of it. and paoe.lt where the public mind sha I est'nthj belief th

It is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will liU<li it roi ward till it sliall become ailie law ul in all the ;-tatcs oid as wtl! as urw, Nurtli as well .-.b Suutii," That extract and the sentiments expressed in it, have been extremely cft'ensive to Judge Doug- las. He has warred upon them as Satan does upon the Bible. l)Hnihffr. His perversions upon It are endless. Here now are my views upon It in brief. I said we were now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed ob- ject and contident promise of putting an end to the slavery agitation. Is it not so? When that Nebraska bill was brought forward four years ago last January, was it not for the " avowed object" of putting an end to the slavery agita- tion ? We were to have no more agitation in Congress; it was all to be banished to the Ter- ritories. By-the way, I will remark here that, as Judge Douglas is very fond of complimenting Mr. Crittenden in these days, Mr. Critienden has said there was a falsehood in that whole business, for there was no slavery agitation at that timeto allay. We were for a little while quiet on the troublesome thing and that very allaying plaster of Judge Douglas', stirred it up again. applni-ion--.tt^..u...^.;i.^--. Bat was it not understood or intimated with the "confident promise" of Dutting an end to the slavery agitation. Surely it was. In every speech you heard Judge Dougles make, until he got into this "imbroglio," as they call it, with the Administration about the Lecotrpton Con- stitution, every speech on that Nebraska bill was full of his felicitations that we were just at the end of the slavery agitation. The last tip of the last joint of the old serpent's tail was just drawing out of view. QUBSOBSaa^ teg<*w. But has it proved so? I have asserted that under that policy that -,- agitation "has not onlvf ceased, but has con- ..*'^-^ stantly augmented." When was there ever- a greater agitation in Congress than last winter ? When was it as great in the country as to-day ? There was a collateral object in the introduc- tion of that Nebrasda policy which wasto clothe the people of the Territories with a superior de- gree of self-government, beyond what they had ever had before. The first object apd the main one of conferring upon the people a higher de- gree of " self government," is a question of fact to be determined by you in answer to a single question. Have you ever heard or known of a people any where on earth who had as little to do, as. in the first instance of its use, the people of Kansas had with this same right of "self- government?" liwnfl miiili..... In its main policy, and in its collateral object, it has been nothing but a living, creeping lie from the time of its'introduction till to-day. UMMKngaw. I have intimated that I thought the agitation would not cease until a crisis should have been reached and passed. I have stated in what way I thought it would be reached and passed. I have said that it might gojone way or the other. We might, by arresting the further spread of it and placing it where the fathers 'originally placed it, put it where the public mind should rest in tlie belief that it was in thg course of ul- timate extinction. Thus the agitati;n may cease. It may be pushed forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South. I have said, and I repeat, my wish is that the further spread of it may be arrested, and that it may be placed where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction. ' flIntiii nniroi*""!! I have expressed that as my wish. I entertain the opinion upon evidence sufficient to my mind, that the fathers of this Government placed that

institution where the public mind did rest in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction. Let me ask why they made provision that the source of slavery the African slave trade-should be cut off at the end of twenty years? Why did they make provision that in all the new territory we owned at that time slavery should be forever inhibited? Why stop its spread in one direction and cut off its source in another, if they did not look to us being placed in the course of ultimate extinction? Again; the institution of slavery is only mentioned in the Constitution of the United States two or three times, and in neither of these cases does the word "slavery" or "negro race" occur; but covert language is used each time, and for a purpose full of significance. What is the language in regard to the prohibition of the African slave trade? It runs in about this way: "The migration or importation of such persons as Congress of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight." The next allusion in the Constitution to the question of slavery and the black race, is on the subject of the basis of representation, and there the language used is, "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed three-fifths of all other persons." It says "persons," not; Slaves, not negroes; but this "three-fifths" cannot be applied to no other class among us than the negroes. Lastly, in the provision for the reclamation of fugitive slaves it is said; "No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." There again there is no mention of the word "negro" or of slavery. In all three of these places, being the only allusions to slavery in the instrument, covert language is used. Language is used not suggesting that slavery existed or that the black race were among us. And I understand the contemporaneous history of those times to be that covert language was used with a purpose, and that purpose was that in our Constitution, which it was believed and is still hoped will endure forever.

^Sm^ (ill liil %, , * I (

ever-when it should be read by institutio patriotic had passed from a'mTOg'ur"f'h" "l ""^--y ' ?oth.n, on the face 0^""^:^^^:^^ ertr suggestiD^ bat s^oh a ,in....." "" "- eryhad ever existed amoLn*^ f^"> "l'^- fl'l'nailj This is par?"f the f;ji^?***^ 'others of the Wove?nmentelcn^l !"" ""^" *' ed the institution of slavery to nl"" ^""^ """"- lbey expected and intenZrf .r " '<> "" '=l. >u the course of ultimate extiti" " f """"^ be I say that I desire to see th2 ?, 'k" ^""^ "aj^^" It arrested I only say I des re f^"""" "P""^" "f which the fathers ha^ve Sdone 'V^" r*^ *^ I desire tp see it plac-d h/ *u ^^" I say iU rest in the beUef "tlr,> " "> Public mind "itimate extinctron/ fonly saV? 'd' """" "" placed where



they placed the first of these that our fathers, as Justice Brandeis said in *McCleskey v. Kemp*, "made this government a part of the American dream." Understand the sentence. "The first of these" assumes that slavery is a part of the American dream, was introduced by the Founding Fathers. The exact truth is, it was introduced by the slave states, the Constitution. The evidence of the

[illegible]



have we had perfect peace in regard to this thing which I say is an element of discord in this Union? We have sometimes had peace, but when was it? It was . when the institution of slavery remained quiet where it was. We have had difficulty and turmoil whenever it has made a struggle to spread itself where it was not. I ask then if experience does not speak in thunder tones tell us that the pohoy which has given peace to the country heretofore, being returned to, gives the guarantee of peace again. I "Ul" iri^i^r^s^::^::^,lff.,n^^ P^^^^,l"PPO^e. Cbctiu ..ud "ingtiratj 1 agree that there are office sopskr^ "mongstus. The lJ.ble says somewhere that we are desperately selfish. 1 think we would have discovered that fact without the Bible I do not claim that I am any less so than the average of men, but I do claim that I am not more selfish than Judge Douglas IBI^ l'iiitMi4ppia(..j ^ Lt*rs^of But is it true that aHie'difficulty and agitation we have in regard to this institution of slave? v springs from ofBfee segkiBg^irom the more numerous political traitors the truth? S many times have w^dagger from "this ^,IZ t^on? Go back to the day of the Kijoiui Compromise,. Go back to the Nullification question, at the bottom of which lay the same slavery question. Go back to the time of the Annexation of Texas. Go back to the trouble of the Fugitive Slave Law, J " ^P^'^^ .'^'^^ institution. There tjiT^!^ and quarrel on minor questions yet It extends not beyond the parties themselves But does TO* this question make a disturbance in the "P^^^^r'^'^^'- situation? into the churches and rend them asunder^ What divided the great Methodist Church in two parts, North and South ? What has raked this constant disturbance in every Presbyterian General Assembly that meets^har d^ ^5 the Unitarian Church in the United States verchHv tT'^'^^ ago ? What has jarred and split the Jf? American Tract Society recently 1,nf JS ** ?! ti^g it> but sure to divide it in two^hrld^ T not this same mischief dfpn ..a.^trj ' ^^ " somehow operates^Z^t^t r^i^lf^? ZTH^A' a^ole'ty' i^Tjt*'^^-'^^ iii etSyTvrut^of ociety--in politics, in religion in human life? ' S^l ^l's^tKf "*/^/ ^ ^ cians?^TCrir'e:iSi'g,f;o::;Vhc?i'^'^o^ titt/ tTfneo^,^^^? ^'^^ government raid against the people to be) still and subdued and pretending that it is in s^.^din^y^s^pl^ ^F\ 'P^ .'^'^^'^ght not to talk about it ? luyiiitiigiin!<iinia>nd4<mji;hoi!J If you will get everybody else to stop talking about it, I assure I will quit before they have half done so. 16*- ><pAiihto-. , But where* is the philosophy or statesmanship which assumes that you can quiet that disturbing element in our society which has disturbed us for more than half a century, which has been the only serious danger that has threatened our institutions-I say K I 'M'^ philosophy or the statesmanship based on the assumption that we are to quit maintaining^ t?l^S6j, and that the public mind is all at once to cease being agitated *Y 12 , ^'^^ ^ ^ *b policy here in the North that Douglas is advocating-that we are to care nothing about it! 1 ask you if it is not a false philosophy? Is it not a false statesmanship that undertakes to build up a system of policy upon the basis of caring nothing about the very ^'^^Oj^katevery^ody does care the most about of experience has shown we care a very great deal about? |gti-iw.B*..a^*,. ^ ^ The Judge alludes very often in the course of his remarks to the exclusive right which the states have to decide the whole thing for themselves. I agree with him very readily that the different States have that right. He is but a haggard man of straw when he assumes that I am contending against the States to do as they please -about it Our

controversy with him is in regard to the new Territories. We agree that when the States come in as States they have the right and the power to do as they please. We have no power as citizens of the free States or in our federal capacity as members of the Federal Union through the general government, to disturb slavery in the States where it exists. We profess constantly that we have no more inclination than belief in the power of the Government to disturb it; yet we are driven constantly to defend ourselves from the assumption that we are warring upon the rights of the States. What I insist upon is, that the new Territories shall be kept free from it while in the Territorial condition. Judge Douglas assumes that we have no interest in them that we have no right whatever to interfere I think we have some, interest. I think that as white men we have. Do we not wish for an outlet for our surplus population, if I may so express myself? Do we not feel an interest in getting to that outlet with such institutions as we would like to have prevail there? If you go to the Territory opposed to slavery and another man comes upon the same ground with his slave, upon the assumption that the things are equal, it turns out that he has the equal right all his way and you have no part of it to quarrel with. If he goes in and makes it a slave Territory, and by consequence a slave State, is it not time that those who desire to have it a free State were on equal ground. Let me suggest it in a different way. How many Democrats are there about here "a thousand" who have left slave States and come into the free State of Illinois to get rid of the institution of slavery Another voice "a thousand and one." I reckon there are a thousand and one. I will ask you, if the policy you are now advocating had prevailed when this country was in a territorial condition, where would you have gone to get rid of it? If you would have found your free State or Territory to go to? And when hereafter, for any cause the people in this place shall desire to have new homes, if they wish to bend of the institution, where will they find the place to go to? U-
^tMi^SSS'S-'I " ^ i r '<ipiltl^>-*MWf-- , Mmi^'

^..^gl^^ \i '- ill t A

No\v in respect of the moral aspect of this question as to whether there is a right or wrong in enslaving a negro, I am still in favor of our new Territories being in such a condition that white men may find a home may find some spot where they can better their condition where they can settle upon new soil and better their condition in life, "I am in favor of this not merely, (I must say it here as I have elsewhere,) for our own people who are born among us, but as an outlet (or free outlet) for every where in the world over in which the faithful and patriotic, and all other virtuous from all the world, may find new homes and better their conditions in life, I have stated upon former occasions, and I may as well state again, what I understand to be the real issue in this controversy between Judge Douglas and myself. On the point of my wanting to make war between the free and the slave States, there has been no issue between us. So, too, when he assumes that I am in favor of introducing a perfect social and political equality

between the white and- bljai'li races. These are false issues, upon which Judge Douglas hus tried to force the controversy. There is no foundation in truth' for the charge that I maintain either of these propositions. Tiie leal issue in this controversy the one pressing upon every mind is the sentiment on the part of one class that looks upon the institution of slavery as a wrong, and of another cluss that does not look upon it as a wrong. The senti- ment ihat contemplates the institution of slav- ery in this country as a wrong is the sentiment of the Kepublican party. It is the sentiment around which all their actions all their argu- ments circle from which all their cpropositions, radiate. They look upon"- it as being a moral, social and political wrong; and while t ey con- template it as such, they nevertheless have due regard for its" actual existence among us, and the difficulties of getting rid of it ia any satisfactory way aud -to ail the^ consti- tutional obligations thrown about it. Yet hav- ing a due regard for these, they defir'" o^ r^n'viT 'Tn legard to it that looks to its not creating any l more danger. They insist that it should as far as may be, be treated as a wrong, and one of the methods of treating it aiiawrong is to mahepro- ' vision that it sfiall grow no larger. l.ud an- .fjilaiaa*. They also deiire a policy that looks to ' , a peaceful end of slavery at sometime, as bein^ wrong. These are the viewrthey entertain in'- , regard to it as I understand them; and all their sentiments all their arguments and proposi- ; tions are brought within this range. I have said and I repeat it here, that if there be a man- amongsi us who does not think that the iustitu- tion ot slavery is wrong in any one of the as- pects of which I have spoken, he is mispWoed aud ought not to be with us. And it there be a man amongst us who is so impatient of it as a wrong as to disregard its actual presence among us and the dithcalty of. getting rid of it suddenly in a satisfactory way, and to disregard the constitutional obligations thrown about it, that man is misplaced if he is on our platform. We disclaim sympathy with him in practical ac- tion. He is not placed properly with us. On this subject ot treating it as a wrong, and limiting its spread, let me say a word. Has any thing ever threatened the existence of this Union save and except. this very institution of Slavery? What is it that we hold.; most dear amongst us? Our own liberty and prosperity. What has ever threatened our liberty and pros- perity save and except this institution of , Sla- very ? If this is true, how do you propose io improve the condition. o things by enlarging Slavery by spreading it out and making it bigger? You may have a wen or a cancer upon your person and: not be able to cut it' out lest you bleed to death; but surely it is no way to cure it, to engraft it and spread it over your whole body. That is- : no proper way of tre.ating what you regard a wrong. You see this peaceful way of dealing with it as a wrong restrictiugtiie spread of it, and not allowing it to go into new countries where it has not already existed. That is t)ie peaceful way, the old-fashioned way, the way : in which the fathers themselves set us the example, r On the other hand, I have said there is a sen- timent whioh treats it as net being wrong. That is the Democratic sentiment M this day. I do, not mean to say that every inan who 3tands within that range positively asserts that it is right. That class will include all who posi- tively assert that it is right, and- all who like Judge Douglas treat it as indifforeHt and do not say it is either right or wrong. l.'lieSe two classes.ot men fall within the general clas9>i}f those who' do not look upon it as

a wrong. , And if there be among you anybody who supposes that he - as a Democrat, can consider himself "as much opposed to slavery as anybody," { v,aulcl like to reason with him. You never treat it as a wrong. What other thing that you consider as a wrong, do you deal with as you deal with that ? Perhaps you say it is wrong, but your leader never does, and you quarrel with anybody who says it is wrong. Although you pretend to say so yourself you can find no fit place,, to deal with it as a wrong. You must not say anything about it in the free territories, because it is not here. You must not say anything about it, in the slave States, because it is there. You must not say anything about it in the pulpit, because that is religion and has nothing to do with it. You must not say anything about it in politics, because that will disturb the security of " my place. " fsl}aili-'i'i^i'Miali""*V'. ' | i'i'1 i<'il>i>l's. There is no place to talk about slavery being a wrong, although you say yourself it is a wrong. But finally you will screw yourself up to the belief that if the people of the slave States should adopt a system of gradual emancipation on the slavery question, you would be in favor of it. You would be in favor of it. You say that is getting it in the right place, and you would be glad to see it succeed. But you are deceiving yourself. You all know that Frank Blair and Ciatz Brown, down ;' >-eir. St. Louis, undertook to introduce that system in Missouri. They fought as valiently as they could for the system of gradual emancipation which you pretend you would be glad to see succeed. Now I will bring you to the test. After a hard fight they were beaten, and when the news came over here you threw up your hats and hailed for Democracy. jaiti.ir.t^^i^^:^^m*^,^,jf^ er More, than that, take all the argument made in favor of the system you have proposed, and it carefully excludes the "idea that there is anything wrong in the institution of slavery. The arguments to sustain the policy carefully excluded it. ^Even before they you heard Judge Douglas quarrel with me because I uttered a wish that it might sometime come to an end. Although Henry Clay could say he wished every slave in the United States was in the country >l'.his ancestors I am denounced by those , pretending to respect Henry Clay for uttering a wish that it might sometime, in a peaceful way, come to an end. The Democratic policy in regard to that institution will not tolerate the merest breath, the slightest hint, of the least degree of wrong about it. Try it by some of Judge Douglas' arguments. He says he 'do not care whether it is voted up or voted down' in the Territories. ' I do not care myself in dealing with that expression, whether it is intended to be expressive of his individual sentiment on the subject, or only of the national policy he desires to have established. It is alike valuable for my purpose. Any man can say that who does not see anything wrong in slavery, but no man can logically say it who does see a wrong in it; because no man can logically say he don't care whether a wrong is voted up or voted down. How may it be he don't care whether an indifferent thing is voted up or down, but he cannot logically have a choice between a right thing and a wrong thing. He contends that whatever community wants slaves has a right to have them. So they have if it is not a wrong. But if it is a wrong, he cannot say people have a right to do wrong. He says that upon the score of equality, slaves should be allowed to go in a new Territory, like other property. This is strictly logical if there is no difference between it and other property; .If it and other property are equal, his argument is

entirely .logical. But if you insist that one is wrong and the other right, there is, no use to institute a comparison between right and Wrong. You may turn over everything in the Democratic policy from beginning to end, Whether in the shape it takes on the statue book, in the shane it takes in the Dred Scott decision, in the shape it takes ip conversation or the shape it takes in short maxim-like arguments it everywhere carefully eioludes the idea that there is anything wrong in it. That is the real issue. That is the issue that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal Struggle between these two principles right and wrong throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time; and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity and the ot-her the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, " You work and toil and earn bread-; and I'll eat it." <t64-p" ^ila!iH.I No matte*' in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from One race of haen as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle. I was glad to express my gratitude at Quiucy, and I re-ex- press it here to Judge Douglas- that he looks to no end of the institution of slavery. That will help the people to see where the struggle really is. It will hereafter place with us all men who really do wish the wrong may have an end. And whenever we can get . rid of the fog which obscures the real question ' when we can get Judge Douglas and his friends to avow a policy looking to its perpetua- tion-T-we can get out from ainon^ them that class of men and bring them to the side of those who treat it as a wrong. Then there will soon be an end of it, and that end will lje'its "ultimate extinction." Whenever the issue can be dis- tinctly made, and all extraneous matter thrown out so that men can fairly see the real diil'er- : ence between the parties, this oontrover- ' "" sy will soon be settled, aud it will be done peaceably too. There will be no war, no violencs. It will be placed again where the wisest and best men Of the iForld, placed it. Brooks of South Carolina once de- clared that when this Constitution was framed, its framers did not look to the institution exist- ing until this day. When he said this, I think he stated a fact that is'fully borne out by the iistory of the times. But he flisp said they were fetter and wiser men than "the men of these days; yet the men of these days had experience which they had not, and by the invention of the cotton gin it became a necessity in this country ! that slavery should be perpetual. I now say ' that willingly or unwillingly, purposely or with- out purpose. Judge Douglas has been the most : prominent instrument in changing the position fff.the institution of slavery which the fathers of the government expected to come to an eid ere this - and putting it ufon Brooks' cotton gin ba- - sis, MHmW*'^ -placing it where he open- ly confesses he has no desire there shall ever be an end of it. Itnftatffjj>pplniiiMij, J understand I have ten minutesyet. Iwillem- liloy it in saying somethlug about this argument J udge Douglas uses, while he sustains the Dred Scott decision, that the people of the Territories can still somehow exclud slavery. The first thing I ask attention to is the fact that Judge Douglas constantly said, before the decision, that whetlwr they could or not, was a question for the Siipreme Court, tl'iinriioi Bni after

the Court has made the decision he virtually says it is not a question for the Supreme Court, but for the people. BaaowcrlanplittMBi And liowis it he tells us" iiey can exciurto it? K sajs it needs -" notice rosiulations," tmd that admits of t1 'iiaB*isj,iijBw-

m^.

j^glB^ 11 si n 9 * \! \n l :j^.

A -^a,^^

*i^K"*X United States to taVc !=! "houstitutiona of the ?J <1 States t? 1%' "1" "-^" "y " as properfv, ill gife If this propositfon as a matTer 7tf " - especially^ oan prac thispropositon as a iatTerrtf ZTZ 'X' "" ^""^tit^t "nalowta't, 4>ighbor by urs sTde in the IVrHi ""t'*^*- His and needs TerritoriaUemsi.f^ .""^ ""^ ^""^s States which he h^^nil\ " ^ " United' withhold it without JI^r r ' uPP"" ^^^ he siTOws sort of talk abnnr +i, f' \^ ' ^ ^ ' - United States rHSi^!iY"" of th .from trie mouth of any resmof^hu " * < - " i.iv^-----^y ""y respectable man on earth was improperly made anrt r ^f decision Ja,lge Lu'L.las^f ? ntio's a/a?amhoirth^ "" for levers uir o rt,.Pi;.. ir.'t^' .""9e_ who c for r^versinV; decision iChl'-T^*"" :ht? ^r l^M^^-^'^^^ being waged, and the Amariouu army was surround- ed by the enemy in Mexico, he thought that war was unconstitutional, unnecessary and unjust- -kt.*^ He thought u was notcommenoedTSthe right spot, ^/tif^ghilifli;) When t made an incidental allusion of that kind wjl'^j"" " *? *"" " ^ ^ "" Charleston some ' llf h j^v; ^""^."1' "> ':'^P'yi>=g. ^ald that I, Uoug. or the Mexican war and then he ?eared up fuU length, and swore that he never voted against the Piffi ""~^"""".' " * a 8lander-and cauglit hold of Fick in, who sat on the stand, and said, "Here jFicklin^tell the people that it is a lie." (Lmr^ *?*-**;) Well, F.cklin, who had ^s^^^fHj Congress with him, stood up 'and told them all thU ne recoUec ed about it. It was that when George Ashmun, of Massachusetts, brought forward a S lution declaring the war unconstitutional unneces- sanr, and unjust, that Lincoln had vo ed for it ' Yes " said Lmcoio, I did," Thus he ccmf-s-ed that he voted that-the war was wrong, ttat^ur the m7v""* ' ' the wrong, and consequently that he Mexicans were in the right; but charged that I had Slandered him by saying thit he voiea^against the supplies. I never charged him with votinJ against th supplies in my life, because I knef that he was not in Congress when they were voted /T ,-----, v""si'^o wiieu loey were voted (**<wudajjArt-e*;^.) The war was com: menced on the 18th day of May, 1^6, and on that Zy IVff* ?^*^*^* 'i" ^""g^As tD millions of d.,Uara and filty thousand men to prosecute it. During the same session we voted more men and morf money, and at the next session we voted more me and more money, so that by the time Mr. Linraln are entit.lorf . ' ^r..i_^". ^* oouthern States ">" all gone forward, all he could dn w t f^ii .!. are entitled to a^bTnfriessionaf f""r" "" law-that it is a righ?Hxed ?n th ^n""^? ^'^ve J^ut it cannot be m!deavaUabl'^L^""*""<""- uage. /M:^. 'Tt the lead of Oorwm, and prove that the war was not begun on the right spot, and that it was uuoonstitS- t ona unnecessary, and wrong. Remember, too that tms he did after the war had been begun It IS



nothing to be opposed to the declaration of a war another and very different thing to take sides with the enemy against your own country after the war has been commenced. y4fiBiii.*Bd-.heei*) Our army was in Mexico at the lime, many battles had been fought; our citizens, who were defending the honor of their oouniry's flag, were sur- rounded by the daggers, the guns and the poison of - the onemy. Then it was that Corwin made his speech in which ae declared that the American soldiers ought to be welcomed &y tha Mexicans with Dloodj hands and hospitable graves; then it was that Ashmun and Lincoln voted in the House of Kepresentatives that the war was unconstitutional and unjust; and Ashmua's resolution,- Uorwin'- speech, and Lincoln's vole were sent to Mexico and . read at the head of the Mexican army, to prove to them that there was a Mexican party in the Con- gress of the United States who were doing all in their power to aid them. (*iShtf*. *be-troth " Llssto;*toaeiMi^ That a man who takes sides with the common enemy against his owo country in time of war should rejoice in a war bein made on me now, is very natural. (Immense ap^ plause.) And m my opinion, no other kind of a man would rejoice in it. ("jWhat'i) mm r ' liuniaL Mr. Lincoln has told you a great deal to-day about his being an old line Clay Whig. *Afc&i ^MMfefflaaj') Bear in mind that there are a great many old Uay Whigs down in this region It is more agreeable, therefore, for him o talk about ih old Clay Whig party than it is for him to talk Abohtionism. We did not hear much about the old Clay Whig party up in the Abolition districts. How much of an old line Henry Clay Whi" was he? Have you read Qeu. Singleton's speech at Jacksonville? (**i-*fIV-*h<i) You know that (ien. binglelon was, for twenty-five years the confidential friend of Henry Clay in Illinois' and he, testified that in 1847, when the constitu- tional convention ot this State was in session, the Whig members were invited to a Whig caucus at the house of Mr, Lincoln's brotherin law, where Mr. Lincoln proposed to throw Henry Clay over- board and take up (Jen. Tavlör in his place, giving, as his reason, that if the Whigs did not tak up Gen. Taylor the Democrats would, (^.'hpoi^ aa'd- UMghrtat) Singleton testifies that Lincoln, in that speech, urged, as another reason for throwing Henry Clay overboard, that the Whigs had fought long enough for principle and ought to begin to fight for success. Singleton also testifies that Lin- coln's speech did have the effect of cutting Clay's throat, and that h3, Singleton, and others with- drew from the caucus in indignation. He further states that when they got to Philadelphia to attend the national convention of the Whig party, that Lincoln was there, the bitter and deadly enemy of "Clay, and that he tried to keep him (.Singleton) out of the convention because he insisted on voting for Clay, and Lincoln was determined to have Tay- that we like the instifutrorof'lat;ry!' w:^ less to have no taste for running nA . >P "tirVhviri'. ' P fessno"fst:f'r h fro! ' .Pla^^^Brust/jotoVuTdSlnd^Sd" ' Constitution, which guarantees tha^H^f' ** f';v i^t legislation necessary to support it 1 say that no man can deny his oblieatioiv. tn give the necessary legislation to support sTaverr l'i a IVirritory, who believes it is a bonstitutiW?" al right to have it there. No man can wh i ot give theAbolitionist an argTmVnrt'otn/ hi cblgation enjoined by the ooL-stitution ?o en! naci a iugtive slave law. Try it bow It is; 1 safi?fhl't'n "h""^^^^^*^^^ ^^ ""aU! L f L }^^^!"I '^oott decision ia corl rect then the right to hold slavea in ^ lffh"r^-L?'""y ^ constitnlional

with the right of a slaveholder to have his runaway returned to one who can show the distinction between them. The one is express, so that we cannot deny it. The other is construed to be in the constitution, so that he who believes the decision to be correct believes in the right. And the man who argues that by unfriendly legislation, in spite of that constitutional right slavery may be driven from the Territories cannot avoid furnishing an argument by which Abolitionists may deny the obligation to return fugitives, and claim the power to pass laws to the right of the slaveholder to reclaim his fugitive. I do not know how such an argument may strike a popular assembly, but I defy anybody to go before a body of well-educated men to estimate the difference between the constitutional right to reclaim a fugitive, and the constitutional right to hold a slave in a territory, provided this Dred Scott decision is correct. I defy any man to make an argument that will justify unfriendly legislation to deprive a slaveholder of his right to hold his slave in a territory, that will not equally, in all its length, breadth and thickness furnish an argument for nullifying the fugitive slave law. Why there is not such an Abolitionist in the nation as Douglas, after all. Loud and enthusiastic applause. Mr. Lincoln said: "I say that there is not such an Abolitionist as I am in all America. (Laughter.) If he could make the Abolitionists of Illinois believe that, he would not have much show for the Senate. Let him make the Abolitionists believe the truth of that statement and his political back is broken. His first criticism upon me is the expression of his hope that the war of the administration will be promoted and circulated broadcast over the country, executed against me and the Democratic party of weeks, yet not a word have we heard from Mr. Lincoln with respect to that. Coin on the Subject, except that he is an old line Clay Whig. Mr. Lincoln rejoiced with very great joy when he found the mangled remains of the murdered Whig statesman lying cold before him. Now, Mr. Lincoln tells you that he is an old line Clay Whig! (Laughter.) Gen. Singleton testifies to the facts I have named in a public speech which has been printed and circulated broadcast over the State for his State with vigor. He wants that war prosecuted with vigor; I have no doubt of it. His hopes, his hopes of success, and the hopes of his party depend solely upon it. They have no chance of destroying the; ever advocate? Democracy of this State except by the aid of Federalism. Wilmot provision. Federal patronage, federal office-holders here and there. It was that agitation that brought Clay forth. I have seen it in the Senate of the United States, to see it he although the leaders all intend to vote directly in the Senate of the United States, to see it he the Abolition

ticket, and only leave the firemen horned "O". His great wisdom and experience, and to vote this separate ticket who refuse to go into the renown of his name, do something to restore the Abolition camp, (i.e. #1 to a*like-s) There is peace and quiet to a disturbed country. Who got is something really refreshing in the thought that "Peace" sectional strife that Clay had to be called Mr. Lincoln is in favor of prosecuting one war vigorously. ("" -rc^wprn^ ^ xt is the first war I ever knew him to be in favor of prosecuting. (Eiaiawd4u^ttr.) It is the first war that I ever knew him to believe to be just or constitutional. IL^ u^n).r uud cheers.) When the Mexican war broke out MiMiMiMmm

4;

Mr. Lincoln upon to quell I have heard Lincoln boast that he voted forty-two times for the Wilmot proviso, and that he would have voted as many times more if he could, (aiauahtet.) Lincoln is the man, connection with Thos. Seward, Chas. Giddings, and other Abolitionists, who got up that strife that I helped Olay to put down, (jj^wnwdoaa-agplttasa.) Henry Clay came back to the Senate in 1845, and saw that he must do something to restore peace to the country. The Union Whigs and the Union Democrats welcomed him the moment he arrived, as the man for the occasion. We believed that he, of all men on earth, had been preserved by Divine Providence to guide us out of our difficulties, and we Democrats rallied under Clay then, as you Whigs in nullification time rallied under the banner of old Jackson, forgetting party when the country was in danger, in order that the Union might have a country first, and parties afterwards. (Tlin 11 iiiiiimiai^iwiiWiiiiir""") , And this reminds me that Mr. Lincoln told you that the slavery question was the only thing that ever disturbed the peace and harmony of the Union. Did not nullification once raise its head and disturb the peace of this Union in 1822? Was that the slavery question, Mr. Lincoln? Did not disunion raise its monster head during the last war with Great Britain? Was that the slavery question, Mr. Lincoln? The peace of this country has been disturbed three times, once during the war with Great Britain, once on the tariff question, and once on the slavery question. (ytuaM)..eBis6TrJte5,-Jtoi#liB) His argument, therefore, that slavery is the only question that has ever created dissension in the Union falls to the ground. It is true that agitators are enabled now to use this slavery question for the purpose of sectional strife. (AliHaniit'ililMi.") He admits that in regard to all things else, the principle that I advocate, making each State and territory free to decide for itself ought to prevail. He insists the cranberry laws, and the oyster laws, and he might have gone on though the whole list with the same effect. I say that all these laws are local and domestic, and that local and domestic concerns should be left to each State and each territory to manage for itself. If agitators would acquiesce in that principle, there never would be any danger to the peace and harmony of this Union. J_ " Il'liiitii .,aoAan.d..oiMai-) Mr. Lincoln tries to avoid the main issue by attacking the truth of my proposition, that our fathers made this government divided into free and slave States,

recognizing the right of each to decide all its local questions for itself Did they not thus make it? It is true that they did not establish slavery in any of the States, or abolish it in any of them; but finding thirteen States twelve of which were slave and one free, they agreed to form a government uniting them together, as they stood divided into free and slave States, and to guarantee forever to each State the right to do as it pleased on the slavery question. (iibamk) Having thus made the government, and conferred this right upon each State forever, I assert that this government can exist as they made it, divided into free and slave States, if any one State chooses to retain slavery, (taumm.) He says that he looks forward to a time when slavery shall be abolished everywhere. I look forward to a time when each State shall be allowed to do as it pleases. If it chooses to keep slavery forever, it is not my business, but its own; if it chooses to abolish slavery, it is its own business not mine. I care more for the great principle of self-government, the right of the people to rule, than I do for all the negroes in Christendom. (MBMe^ I would not endanger the perpetuity of this Union. I would not blot out the great inalienable rights of the white men for all the negroes that ever existed. (Ji-DenvdftpfiUMe.) Hence, I say, let us maintain this government on the principles that our fathers made it, recognizing the right of each State to keep slavery as long as its people determine, or to abolish it when they please. (Clio!iini>) But Mr. Lincoln says that when our fathers made this government they did not look forward to the state of things now existing; and therefore he thinks the doctrine was wrong; and he quotes Brooks, of South Carolina, to prove that our fathers then thought that probably slavery would be abolished, by each State acting for itself before this time. Suppose they did; suppose they did not foresee what has occurred, does that change the principles of our government? They did not probably foresee the telegraph that transmits intelligence by lightning, nor did they foresee the railroads that now form the bonds of union between the different States, or the thousand mechanical inventions that have elevated mankind. But do these things change the principles of the government? Our fathers, I say, made this government on the principle of the right of each State to do as it pleases in its own domestic affairs, subject to the constitution, and allowed the people of each to apply to every new change of circumstance such remedy as they may see fit to improve their condition. This right they have for all time to come. (hpew.) Mr. Lincoln went on to tell you that he does not at all desire to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists, nor does his party. I expected him to say that down here. (XtiaigittBs.) Let me ask him then how he is going to put slavery in the course of ultimate extinction everywhere, if he does not intend to interfere with it in the States where it exists? (HiMinaHhAlliiMw.) He says that he will prohibit it in all territories, and the inference is then that unless they make free States out of them he will keep them out of the Union; for, mark you, he did not say whether or not he would vote to admit Kansas with slavery or not, as her people might apply; (he forgot that as usual, &c;) he did not say whether or not he was in favor of bringing the territories now in existence into the Union on the principle of Clay's compromise measures on the slavery question. I told you that he would not. (ttrwito-bitM;-ko.dijUMj 4i*4tyfe.) He says that he will prohibit slavery in all the territories, and thus force them

all to become free States, surrounding the slave States with a cordon of free States, and hemming them in, keeping the slaves confined to their present limits whilst they go on multiplying until the soil on which they live will no longer feed them, and he will thus be able to put slavery in a course of ultimate extinction by Starvation. (Slgsr*^ He will extinsuisb slavery m tj^e t.uutijcia Stated as the French i?enprnl pv terminated the Algerines when ho 'smfkd them out. He IS gomg to extinguish slavery by sur- roundmg the slave Staters, hemniin| m the t^ ln,/1J'^''''^ ''''^ '* of Existence as you smoke a iox out of his hole. And aيتد'^hnff- *'^'' '''' '' '' ''^'^ f humanity and Christianity, m order that we may get rid ?athpr 'f'^l/'''''', ''''<* '''' ''''tailed '>P'' ''= fathers of holding slaves. (l anflht,a .nd ghn.^.). Mr Lmco n makes out that line of policy, and a - 8hrsti f'r''''''r'. ' ''<' ''justice, and to the HjftZlf''-'^'^ the community to sustain him. d JS ^ man who holds to the contrary tn il.J ^ the position of the king who claimed ^JT ^J '^''''\ "Sht. Let us examine for a ^r ^h H-''''^'^,^' principle it was that over- rr,7 n i'''' ';;''* <" ^"Se the Third to gov ern us Did not these colonies rebel because the British parliament had no right to pass laws con tlzf; *'''' P P'''^*.v "Id domestic and private Jwfi, b"-.' ''? ' '''' ^nsent? We demanded law ^^ ''!k government should not pass such laws unless they gave us representation in the body passing them,-and this tLe British govern mem insisting on doinir.-we went to war, on the principle that tho home government' should wHV,,^,,^'- l''''^ govern distant colonies without giving them a representation. Now Mr Lincoln proposes to govern the territories without giving the people a representation, and cabs on Congress to pass Uw controlling their propriy and aomesic concerns without their consent and against their will. Thus, he asserts for his party the identical pnriopie asserted by George lit and the tones ot tfie Ksvolution. (filfiimx.) 1 ask you to look into.lhese things, and then to tell me whe her the democracy or the abolitionists are right. 1 hold that the people of a terriiorv hke those of a State, (I use the language of M'r Buchanan m his ietler of acceptance,) have the right to decide tor theiu.>elve3 whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits. (!.That's,the, Id^.,' Uurmb..*M.-JagUa,") The point upon which Chief Justice laney expresses his opinion is simply tais, that sl^tves being property, stand on an equal footing with other property, and oonsequent- ly tfat the owner has the samo right to carry that property into a territory that he has any other, subject to the same conditions. Suppose that one of your merchants was to take fifty or one bundled ihousand dollars worth of liquors to Kan- sas. He,has a right to go there underthat decision, but when he gets there he finds the Maine liquor law m force, and what can he do with his property after he gets it there? He cannpt sell it, he can- not use It, It IS subject to the local law, and that law IS against him, and the best thing he can do with It IS to bring it back into Missouri or Illinois and sell it. It you take negroes to Kansas, as Col, Jett. Davis said in his Baugor speech, from which I have quoted today, you must take them there sub- ject to the local law. Il the people want the insti- tution of slavery they will protect and encoarage it; but if they do not want it they will withhold that protection, and the absence of local legislation pro- tecting slavery excludes it as completely as a posi- tive prohibition. (i-T.b.,i's,S(yt.naiiitift!niMr) You slaveholders of Missouri might as weU underjtand what you know prsctiually, that you cannot carry slavery where the people do not want

it. g**atto :mm) AH you have a right to ask is that the peo- ple shall do as they please; if they want slavery let them have it; if they do not want it, allow thcra to rehjse to encourage it. My friends,. If, as 1 i^iive said before, we will only live up to this great fundamental principle there will be peace between the Nortn and the sSith. Mr. iincolu admits t at under the constitution on all domestic queatioiis, except slavery, we ought not to interfere wiith the people of each State. What right have we io interfere with slavery any more than we have to interfere with any other question. He says (hat this slavery question is now the bone of conteniion. Wby? Simply oe- cause agitators have combined in all the" free States to make war upon it. Suppose the agita tors in the States should combine in one-half of the Onion to make war upon the railroad system of the other hall ? They would thus be driven to the same sectional strife. Suppose one section makes war upon any other peculiar institution of the opposite section, end th'e same strife is pro- duced. The only remedy and safety is that we sh'-ll stand by 'the constitution as our lathers made it, obey the laws as they are passed, while they stand the proper test and sustain the decisions of the Supreme Court and the constituted autho- rities. I i<^^Ujt' 3^." "tfmtit'fma'-'

s >' ^-<<Bia^^^

&ui i-H.-'a^.-jKi ' ^ ii i '^^ *^i0ft'^.-. ^y*F^

Sk^'flTP^

mk *i-tf^f--.S^ / tm^' '^jjOTJi'^jj- f-^^*^-- 173^.

&Kr.,^m^.. miiM4,mm^m.

i{a^i^;;g^^fcBs

-jm ;?N-^) |b?^>.'. ^^ "^^ 4,-^ f l{iif;;g%ltBS